arXiv:1205.3199v1 [math.AG] 14 May 2012

CONFORMAL BLOCKS AND COHOMOLOGY IN GENUS 0

PRAKASH BELKALE AND SWARNAVA MUKHOPADHYAY

Abstract. We give a characterization of conformal blocks in terms of the singular cohomology of suitable smooth projective varieties, in genus 0 for classical Lie algebras and G_2.

1. Introduction

Consider a finite dimensional simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, a non-negative integer k called the level and a N-tuple $\vec{\lambda}=(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N)$ of dominant weights of $\mathfrak{g}$ of level k. To this data [14, 15] associate a vector bundle of conformal blocks $\mathcal{V}=\mathcal{V}_{\vec{\lambda},k}$ on $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{g,N}$, the moduli stack of stable N-pointed curves of genus g. The fibers of $\mathcal{V}$ on $\mathfrak{M}_{g,N}$ can also be described in terms of sections of natural line bundles on suitable moduli stacks of parabolic principal bundles on N-pointed curves of genus g (see the survey [13]).

Now suppose $g=0$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the configuration of N points on $\mathbb{A}^1$. Let $\vec{z}=(z_1,\dots,z_N)\in\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z})$ be the corresponding N-pointed curve. Consider the space of conformal blocks $V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z}))$ associated to this data. In [2] (generalizing work of Ramadas [9]), an injective map from $V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z}))$ to the (topological) cohomology of a smooth and projective variety $\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}$ was constructed (we recall this construction in Section 2). Our aim here is to characterize the image of this injective map, for classical $\mathfrak{g}$ and G_2. This gives a cohomological description of genus 0 conformal blocks. We hope that the result extends to the remaining cases for $\mathfrak{g}$, but note that our methods get more difficult to implement in these cases (see Remark 17.5).

Fix the data of a Cartan decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{h}\oplus\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}$$

where $\Delta\subseteq\mathfrak{h}^*$, the set of roots, is decomposed into a union $\Delta_+\cup\Delta_-$ of positive and negative roots. The set of simple (positive) roots is denoted by R. A Killing form $(\ ,\ )$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ induces one on $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{h}^*$. Normalize the Killing form by requiring that $(\theta,\theta)=2$, where $\theta\in\Delta_+$ is the highest root. Let $\kappa=k+g^*$ where g^* is the dual Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let us recall the main result of [2]. Assume that $\mu=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\lambda_i$ is in the root lattice (otherwise $V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X})=0$) and $(\lambda_i,\theta)\le k, i\in[N]$. Write $\mu=\sum n_p\alpha_p$, where α_p are the simple positive roots and $n_p\ge 0$. Fix a map $\beta:[M]=\{1,\dots,M\}\to R$, so that $\mu=\sum_{a=1}^{M}\beta(a)$.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 17B67, 14H60, Secondary 32G34, 81T40.

The authors were partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0901249.

Introduce variables $t_1,\dots,t_M \in \mathbb{P}^1 - \{\infty, z_1,\dots,z_N\}$ and consider the following Schechtman-Varchenko master function [10]:

$$\mathcal{R} = \prod_{1\le i<j\le N}(z_i-z_j)^{\frac{-(\lambda_i,\lambda_j)}{\kappa}}\prod_{a=1}^{M}\prod_{j=1}^{N}(t_a-z_j)^{\frac{(\lambda_j,\beta(a))}{\kappa}}\prod_{1\le a<b\le M}(t_a-t_b)^{\frac{-(\beta(a),\beta(b))}{\kappa}}$$

Let

$$X_{\vec{z}} = \{(t_1,\dots,t_M)\in\mathbb{A}^M : t_a\neq t_b, t_a\neq z_i, i\in[N], a<b\in[M]\}.$$

Fix a sufficiently divisible positive integer C so that

$$C(\lambda_i,\lambda_j),\ C(\beta(a),\beta(b)),\ C(\beta(a),\lambda_i)\in\mathbb{Z}, \forall a,b\in[M],\ i,j\in[N],\ a<b,\ i<j. \tag{1.1}$$

and an "evenness" assumption

$$C(\alpha,\alpha)\in 2\mathbb{Z}, \forall\alpha\in R \tag{1.2}$$

Consider an unramified (possibly disconnected) cover of $X_{\vec{z}}$ given by $Y_{\vec{z}} = \{(t_1,\dots,t_M,y) \mid y^{C\kappa} = P\}$, where

$$P = \prod_{1\le i<j\le N}(z_i-z_j)^{-C(\lambda_i,\lambda_j)}\prod_{a=1}^{M}\prod_{j=1}^{N}(t_a-z_j)^{C(\lambda_j,\beta(a))}\prod_{1\le a<b\le M}(t_a-t_b)^{-C(\beta(a),\beta(b))}. \tag{1.3}$$

The group $\mu_{C\kappa}\subseteq\mathbb{C}^*$, of $(C\kappa)$th roots of unity, acts on $Y_{\vec{z}}$. Let Σ be the subset of the symmetric group S_M on M letters given by

$$\Sigma = \{\sigma\in S_M \mid \beta(\sigma(a)) = \beta(a)\}.$$

Our "evenness" assumption (1.2) ensures that $G = \Sigma\times\mu_{C\kappa}$ acts on $Y_{\vec{z}}$ by the rule

$$(\sigma,c)(t_1,\dots,t_M,y) = (t_{\sigma^{-1}(1)},\dots,t_{\sigma^{-1}(M)},cy)$$

Define the character $\chi : G\to\mathbb{C}^*$ by

$$\chi(\sigma,c) = c^{-1}\epsilon(\sigma),$$

where ϵ is the sign character.

By equivariant resolution of singularities, the action of G on $Y_{\vec{z}}$ extends to a suitable smooth compactification $\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}$. In [9] (for $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{sl}_2$) and subsequently in [2] (for arbitrary $\mathfrak{g}$) a natural inclusion (which by [10] preserves connections)

$$V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z}))\hookrightarrow H^{M,0}(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}},\mathbb{C}) \tag{1.4}$$

was constructed. Recall that $H^{M,0}(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}},\mathbb{C})$ injects into $H^M(Y_{\vec{z}},\mathbb{C})$ and is independent of the compactification. The construction in [2], shows that the image of (1.4) is in $H^{M,0}(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}},\mathbb{C})^{\chi}$ (this was noted before for $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{sl}_2$ in [9]). This uses the fact that the relevant correlations functions (see Section 2.5) are symmetric in variables t_a and t_b if $\beta(a)=\beta(b)$ (the sign character is because differentials dt_a and dt_b skew commute in the exterior algebra of forms).

Theorem 1.1. *The inclusion*

$$V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z}))\hookrightarrow (H^{M,0}(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}},\mathbb{C}))^{\chi} \tag{1.5}$$

is an isomorphism for $\mathfrak{g}$ classical and G_2.

Theorem 1.1 for $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ is due to Looijenga [8] and Varchenko (unpublished).

Remark 1.2. *If H is the weight M-part of the cohomology group $H^M(Y_{\vec{z}},\mathbb{C})$ then H carries an action of $\Sigma \times \mu_{C\kappa}$ (using functoriality of mixed Hodge structures). The group on the right hand side of* (1.5) *is* $(H^{M,0})^{\chi}$.

Question 1.3. *Is there a generalization of Theorem* (1.5) *in higher genus (consistent with connections)? See* [3]*, Chapter 6, Section 19.9 for a related statement.*

A few reductions can be made immediately. Consider an element $\omega \in (H^{M,0}(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}},\mathbb{C}))^{\chi}$. On $Y_{\vec{z}}$, ω can be expressed as a differential form $\mathcal{R}p^*\Omega$ where $p : Y_{\vec{z}} \to X_{\vec{z}}$ is the covering map. Furthermore Ω is of the form

$$\Omega = Q(t_1,\dots,t_M)dt_1dt_2\dots dt_M$$

where Q is symmetric under the action of Σ. These properties follow immediately from the invariance conditions. The main body of the proof is broken up into two steps:

1.0.1. *The first step.* With Ω as above, using the symmetry of Q under the action of Σ and the fact that $\omega = \mathcal{R}p^*\Omega$ extends to (any) compactification of $Y_{\vec{z}}$ (or equivalently that $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ is square integrable) we will show that Ω is a log-form on $X_{\vec{z}}$ (the notion of a log-form is reviewed in Section 3). A part of this argument is done case by case (for classical Lie algebras and G_2).

1.0.2. *The second step.* We will use results in [10, 1, 7] to conclude the argument. From suitable log-forms, [10] construct elements in duals of tensor products of Verma modules (of the corresponding Lie algebra "without Serre relations"). We show that these elements lie in the space of conformal blocks thereby showing the surjectivity of (1.5). This step again uses the square integrability of $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ and generalizes a similar statement in the works of Looijenga and Varchenko.

2. Conformal blocks

The affine Lie algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ is defined to be

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g}\otimes\mathbb{C}((\xi))\oplus\mathbb{C}c$$

where c is an element in the center of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ and the Lie algebra structure is defined by

$$[X\otimes f(\xi), Y\otimes g(\xi)] = [X,Y]\otimes f(\xi)g(\xi) + c(X,Y)\operatorname{Res}_{\xi=0}(gdf)$$

where $f, g \in \mathbb{C}((\xi))$ and $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$.

Let

$$X(n) = X\otimes\xi^n,\ X = X(0) = X\otimes 1,\ X\in\mathfrak{g}, n\in\mathbb{Z}.$$

2.1. **Representation theory of affine Lie-algebras.** Recall that finite dimensional irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ are parameterized by the set of dominant integral weights P_+ considered a subset of $\mathfrak{h}^*$. To $\lambda \in P_+$, the corresponding irreducible representation V_λ contains a non-zero vector $v \in V_\lambda$ (the highest weight vector) such that

$$Hv = \lambda(H)v, H\in\mathfrak{h}$$

$$X_\alpha v = 0, X_\alpha\in\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \forall\alpha\in\Delta_+.$$

We will fix a level k in the sequel. Let P_k denote the set of dominant integral weights of level k. More precisely

$$P_k = \{\lambda \in P_+ \mid (\lambda, \theta) \leq k\}$$

where θ is the highest (longest positive) root.

For each $\lambda \in P_k$ there is a corresponding integrable irreducible representation $\mathcal{H}_\lambda \supseteq V_\lambda$ of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ (see [2] for more details). The representation $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ when $\lambda = 0$ (still at level k) is called the vacuum representation at level k.

2.2. **Conformal blocks.** We will work with conformal blocks on marked curves in $\mathfrak{M}_{0,N}$ (that is, smooth curves of genus 0 with N marked points). But we will state the definitions in greater generality.

To define conformal blocks we will fix a stable N pointed curve with formal coordinates $\mathfrak{X} = (C; P_1, \dots, p_N, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)$ with $\eta_i : \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{C,P_i} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}[[\xi_i]]$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and choose $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) \in P_k^N$. There are a number of definitions relevant to the situation: Let

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_N = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{g} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}((\xi_i)) \oplus \mathbb{C}c.$$

be the Lie algebra with c a central element and the Lie bracket given by

$$[\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \otimes f_i, \sum_{i=1}^{N} Y_i \otimes g_i] = \sum_{i=1}^{N} [X_i, Y_i] \otimes f_i g_i + c \sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i, Y_i) \operatorname{Res}_{\mathrm{P_i}}(g_i df_i).$$

Let

$$\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{X}) = \mathfrak{g} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \Gamma(C - \{P_1, \dots, P_N\}, \mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_N. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $\vec{\lambda}$ be as above. Set

$$\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}} = \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_N}.$$

For a given $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $f \in \mathbb{C}((\xi_i))$, define $\rho_i(X \otimes f)$ an endomorphism of $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}}$ by

$$\rho_i(X \otimes f)|v_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |v_N\rangle = |v_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes (X \otimes f|v_i\rangle) \otimes \dots \otimes |v_N\rangle$$

where $|v_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_i}$ for each i.

We can now define the action of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_N$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}}$ by

$$(X_1 \otimes f_1, \dots, X_N \otimes f_N)|v_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |v_N\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i(X_i \otimes f_i)|v_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |v_N\rangle.$$

Definition 2.1. *Define the space of conformal blocks*

$$V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}}/\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{X})\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}}, \mathbb{C})$$

Define the set of dual conformal blocks, $V_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}) = \mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}}/\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{X})\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}}$. These are both finite dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces which can defined on families (and commute with base change) [16].

Following Dirac's bra-ket conventions, elements of $V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X})$ (or $\mathcal{H}^*_{\vec{\lambda}}$) are frequently denoted by $\langle\Psi|$ and those of $V_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X})$ (or of $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}}$) by $|\Phi\rangle$ and the pairing by $\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle$.

2.3. **Propagation of vacua.** Add a new point P_{N+1} together with the vacuum representation V_0 of level k, at P_{N+1}. Also fix a formal neighborhood at P_{N+1}. We therefore have a new pointed curve $\mathfrak{X}'$, and an extended $\vec{\lambda}' = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N, \lambda_{N+1} = 0)$. The propagation of vacuum gives an isomorphism

$$V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}'}(\mathfrak{X}') \xrightarrow{\sim} V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}),\ \langle\widehat{\Psi}| \mapsto \langle\Psi|$$

with the key formula

$$\langle\widehat{\Psi}|(|\Phi\rangle \otimes |0\rangle) = \langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle.$$

2.4. **Correlation functions.** Suppose $\mathfrak{X} \in \mathfrak{M}_{g,N}$. Let $\langle\Psi| \in V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X})$, $Q_1, \ldots, Q_M \in C - \{P_1, \ldots, P_N\}$, $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\vec{\lambda}}$, $Q_1, \ldots, Q_M \in C - \{P_1, \ldots, P_N\}$, $Q_i \neq Q_j, i < j$ and corresponding elements $X_1, \ldots, X_M \in \mathfrak{g}$. There is a very important differential called a correlation function

$$\Omega = \langle\Psi|X_1(Q_1)X_2(Q_2)\ldots X_M(Q_M)|\Phi\rangle \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^{M} \Omega^1_{C,Q_i}.$$

Here Ω^1_C is the vector bundle of holomorphic one-forms on C. One way to define Ω is via propagation by vacua: add points $Q_1, \ldots Q_M$ with formal coordinates $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_M$ and consider the elements $X_a(-1)|0\rangle$ in the vacuum representation at those points. Then

$$\Omega = \langle\widehat{\Psi}|X_1(-1)|0\rangle \otimes X_2(-1)|0\rangle \ldots X_M(-1)|0\rangle \otimes |\Phi\rangle d\psi_1 \ldots d\psi_M.$$

2.5. **The extension theorem.** We will henceforth consider the case $C = \mathbb{P}^1$, with a chosen ∞ and a coordinate z on $\mathbb{A}^1 = \mathbb{P}^1 - \{\infty\}$. Consider distinct points $P_1, \ldots, P_N \in \mathbb{A}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ with z-coordinates $z_1, \ldots, z_N$ respectively. The standard coordinate z endows each P_i with a formal coordinate. Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be the resulting N-pointed curve with formal coordinates.

Definition 2.2. *For every positive root δ, make a choice of a non-zero element f_δ in $\mathfrak{g}_{-\delta}$.*

Assume that we are given $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N \in P_k$, such that $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i$ is in the root lattice. Write $\mu = \sum n_p \alpha_p$, where α_p are the simple positive roots. It is easy to see that each n_p is non-negative (for example, by evaluating both sides on H_{α_p}).

Let $|\vec{\lambda}\rangle = |\lambda_1\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\lambda_N\rangle$ be the product of the corresponding highest weight vectors. Now consider and fix a map $\beta : [M] = \{1, \ldots, M\} \to R$, so that $\mu = \sum_{a=1}^M \beta(a)$ with $M = \sum n_p$.

From the introduction, recall the variety $X_{\vec{z}}$ its cover $Y_{\vec{z}}$, its compactification $\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}$ and the master function $\mathcal{R}$ on $Y_{\vec{z}}$. The main result from [2] is the following:

Introduce variables $t_1, \ldots, t_M$ considered points on $\mathbb{P}^1 - \{\infty, P_1, \ldots, P_N\}$ Consider, for every $\langle\Psi| \in V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X})$, the correlation function (see Remark 5.2)

$$\Omega = \Omega_\beta(\langle\Psi|) = \langle\Psi|f_{\beta(1)}(t_1)f_{\beta(2)}(t_2)\ldots f_{\beta(M)}(t_M)|\vec{\lambda}\rangle. \tag{2.2}$$

Theorem 2.3. [9, 2]

1. *The multi-valued meromorphic form $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ on $X_{\vec{z}}$ is square integrable.*
2. *The differential form $p^*(\mathcal{R}\Omega)$ extends to an everywhere regular, single valued, differential form of the top order on any smooth and projective compactification $\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}} \supseteq Y_{\vec{z}}$.*
3. *The resulting map*

$$V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z})) \hookrightarrow H^{M,0}(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}, \mathbb{C}) \subseteq H^M(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}, \mathbb{C}) \tag{2.3}$$

is injective.

Note that by [10], the map $V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z})) \hookrightarrow H^0(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}, \mathbb{C})$ is flat for connections as $\vec{z}$ varies in the configuration space of N distinct points on $\mathbb{P}^1$ (with the KZ connection on $V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z}))$ and the Gauss-Manin connection on $H^0(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}, \mathbb{C})$).

3. A REVIEW OF LOGARITHMIC FORMS

For a smooth algebraic variety X of dimension M, there is complex $\Omega^*_{\log}(X)$ of logarithmic forms on X. Let $j : X \to \overline{X}$ be a smooth compactification of X such that the complement D is a divisor with normal crossings. A regular differential $\omega \in H^0(X, \Omega^m_X)$ is said to be logarithmic if it lies in $H^0(\overline{X}, \Omega^m_{\overline{X}}(\log D))$, this property does not depend upon the chosen compactification (see below). Recall that the complex $\Omega^*_{\overline{X}}(\log D)$ is the smallest subcomplex of $j_*\Omega^*_X$ which contains $\Omega^*_{\overline{X}}$, is stable under exterior products, and such that df/f is a local section of $\Omega^1_{\overline{X}}(\log D)$ on an open subset U whenever f is meromorphic (algebraic) function on $\overline{X}$ which is regular on $X \cap U$.

Locally near a point of D where D is given by $z_1 z_2 \dots z_k = 0$ and $z_1, \dots, z_M$ local coordinates on $\overline{X}$, an element of $\Omega^m_{\overline{X}}(\log D)$ is a linear combination

$$\sum_I f_I d\eta_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge d\eta_{i_k}$$

where the sum is over subsets $I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_m\}$ of $\{1, \dots, M\}$ of cardinality M and $\eta_i = dz_i/z_i$ if $i \leq k$ and dz_i if $i > k$, and f_I is a holomorphic function.

We will list some facts

1. $\Omega^m_{\overline{X}}(\log D)$ is a locally free sheaf on $\overline{X}$.
2. Log forms are suitably functorial: If $f : (\overline{X}, D') \to (\overline{X}, D)$ is a map of pairs as above, then there is an induced map $\Omega^m_{\overline{X}}(\log D)) \to f_*\Omega^m_{\overline{X}'}(\log D')$ and hence on the global sections,
$$H^0(\overline{X}, \Omega^m_{\overline{X}}(\log D)) \to H^0(\overline{X}', \Omega^m_{\overline{X}'}(\log D'))$$
3. Elements of $H^0(\overline{X}, \Omega^m_{\overline{X}}(\log D))$ are d-closed for any m. The resulting map
$$H^0(\overline{X}, \Omega^m_{\overline{X}}(\log D)) \to H^m(X, \mathbb{C}) \tag{3.1}$$
is injective (corollaire 3.2.14 in [6]).
4. By [6], $H^m(X, \mathbb{C})$ has a mixed Hodge structure. The image of (3.1) equals the m-th part ("the smallest") of the Hodge filtration on $H^m(X, \mathbb{C})$.
5. The space of log-forms $\Omega^*_{\log}(X)$ on X as a subspace of $H^0(X, \Omega^*_X)$is well defined, i.e., does not depend upon compactifications.

3.1. **Complements of hyperplane arrangements.** We will restrict now to the case of $X = \mathbb{A}^M - S$ where $S = \cup_{i \in T} H_i$ is a hyperplane arrangement, where $H_i \subset A^M$ is given by linear equation $f_i = 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *The space of log forms on X is the DG algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ inside the space of meromorphic differentials generated by the forms df_i/f_i.*

Proof. Log forms of any degree embed in cohomology, so it suffices to show that the DG algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ inside the space of meromorphic differentials generated by the log forms df_i/f_i maps surjectively into $H^*(X,\mathbb{C})$. This is proved in [5]. $\square$

Restrict further to $X = X_{\vec{z}}$ from the introduction. In a natural manner $X \subseteq (\mathbb{P}^1)^M$. The complement $(\mathbb{P}^1)^M - X$ is not a divisor with normal crossings, but is locally "arrangementlike".

Suppose $\Omega \in H^0(X, \Omega_X)$ is regular along the divisors $t_a = \infty$. The following gives a criterion to decide if Ω is a log form.

Consider the following types of strata $S \subseteq (\mathbb{P}^1)^M$:

(S1) A certain subset of the $t's$ come together (to an arbitrary moving point). That is $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L$ after renumbering (possibly changing β).

(S2) A certain subset of the $t's$ come together to one of the z's. That is $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L = z_1$ after renumbering (possibly changing β).

See Section 10.8 in [17], and [12] for the proof of the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *To show that Ω is a log-form, it suffices to show that the logarithmic order of Ω along each stratum of type (S1), (S2) is ≥ 0.*

3.2. **A basis for the space of log-forms.** A marked partition of $[M]$ into N-parts is a pair $(\vec{\pi}, \vec{k})$, where $\vec{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_N)$ is a sequence of integers such that $\sum_{i=1}^N k_i = M$, and $\vec{\pi} = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_N)$ is a sequence of N maps, with $\pi_j : [k_j] \to [M]$ such that

1. Each π_j is injective.
2. $[M]$ is the disjoint union of the images of π_j.

To such a marked partition of $[M]$, we assign the differential

$$\Omega(\vec{\pi}, \vec{k}) \ = \ \eta_1\eta_2 \ldots \eta_N dt_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dt_M \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$\eta_j = \frac{1}{(t_{\pi_j(1)} - t_{\pi_j(2)})(t_{\pi_j(2)} - t_{\pi_j(3)}) \ldots (t_{\pi_j(k_j)} - z_j)}$$

Lemma 3.3. *The set of forms $\{\Omega(\vec{\pi}, \vec{k})\}$, where $(\vec{\pi}, \vec{k})$ ranges over all marked partitions of $[M]$ with N-parts is a basis for the space $\Omega^M_{\log}(X_{\vec{z}})$ of top degree log forms on X.*

Proof. They are linearly independent, because if given a linear dependence relation, we can successively take residues along divisors $t_a = z_j$. A term $\Omega(\vec{\pi}, \vec{k})$ survives this residue if and only if $a = \pi_j(k_j)$.

They span (cf. [10]): Consider a non-zero product of log forms η of the form $\operatorname{dlog}(t_a - t_b)$ and $\operatorname{dlog}(t_a - z_j)$. Form a graph with $M + N$ vertices: the variables "t_a and z_b", edges: join t_a to t_b if there is a term $\operatorname{dlog}(t_a - t_b)$ in η (similarly join t_a to z_j if there is a $\operatorname{dlog}(t_a - z_j)$). It is easy to see that this graph has no cycles, and is hence a forest. We would like it to be a "set of rays" one for each z_i: one can write η as a sum of such using Lemmas 7.4.3 and 7.4.4 in [10]. $\square$

3.3. **Log forms stable under symmetries.** Suppose we have β as in the introduction. The group S_M from the introduction acts on the space of log forms on $X_{\vec{z}}$. We will restrict this action to $\Sigma \subseteq S_M$.

Let $\Omega^M_{\log}(X_{\vec{z}})^{\epsilon,\Sigma}$ denote the ϵ-character subspace, under the action of Σ on $\Omega^M_{\log}(X_{\vec{z}})$. Consider the set of pairs $(\vec{\delta},\vec{k})$ where $\vec{k}=(k_1,\dots,k_N)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^N k_i = M$ and $\vec{\delta}=(\delta_1,\dots,\delta_N)$ with $\delta_j:\{1,\dots,k_j\}\to\{1,\dots,r\}$ (not necessarily injective). Denote the set of $(\vec{\delta},\vec{k})$ by $\mathcal{B}$.

For a element $(\vec{\delta},\vec{k})\in\mathcal{B}$ define a differential

$$\theta(\vec{\delta},\vec{k})=\sum_{\vec{\pi}}\Omega(\vec{\pi},\vec{k})$$

where the sum is over all π such that $(\vec{\pi},\vec{k})$ is a marked partition of $[M]$ with N parts and with the constraint that $\beta(\pi_j(\ell))$ is the simple root $\alpha_{\delta_j(\ell)}$ for all ℓ.

Lemma 3.4. *The elements $\theta(\vec{\delta},\vec{k})$ for $(\vec{\delta},\vec{k})\in\mathcal{B}$ form a basis of $\Omega^M_{\log}(X_{\vec{z}})^{\epsilon,\Sigma}$.*

4. From log forms to representation theory, first steps

Suppose R is the set of simple positive roots of $\mathfrak{g}$, $r=|R|$ and $e_1,\dots,e_r$ and $f_1,\dots,f_r$ be the corresponding elements in $\mathfrak{g}$. Define a new Lie algebra: $\mathfrak{g}'$ is the Lie algebra with generators $e'_1,\dots,e'_r,f'_1,\dots,f'_r$ and $h\in\mathfrak{h}$ subject to the relations

$$[e'_i,f'_j]=\delta_{ij}h_i$$

$$[h,e'_i]=\alpha_i(h)e'_i,[h,f'_i]=-\alpha_i(h)f'_i,[h,h']=0$$

for all $1\le i,j\le r$; $h,h'\in\mathfrak{h}$. Let $n_{ij}=2\frac{(\alpha_i,\alpha_j)}{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)}$. Consider elements

$$\theta_{ij}=\mathrm{ad}(e'_i)^{-n_{ij}+1}e'_j,\theta^-_{ij}=\mathrm{ad}(f'_i)^{-n_{ij}+1}f'_j$$

There is a natural surjection $\mathfrak{g}'\to\mathfrak{g}$. Write

$$\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{n}^-\oplus\mathfrak{h}\oplus\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{g}'=\mathfrak{x}\oplus\mathfrak{h}\oplus\mathfrak{y}$$

Let $\mathfrak{u}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{u}^-$) be the ideal of $\mathfrak{y}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{x}$) generated by θ_{ij} (resp. θ^-_{ij}). Then $\mathfrak{n}=\mathfrak{y}/\mathfrak{u}$, and $\mathfrak{n}^-=\mathfrak{x}/\mathfrak{u}^-$ (see [11]).

For a dominant integral weight λ, let $M(\lambda)$ be the corresponding Verma module for the finite dimensional lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with highest weight $|\lambda\rangle$. The corresponding Verma module for $\mathfrak{g}'$ will be denoted by $M'(\lambda)$. It is known that $M(\lambda)$ is a naturally isomorphic as an $\mathfrak{n}\oplus\mathfrak{h}$ module to the enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ (similarly, an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{x}\oplus\mathfrak{h}$-modules $M'(\lambda)=\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{x})$). We note that $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{x})$ is a free $\mathbb{C}$ algebra generated by $f'_1,\dots,f'_r$.

There is a surjection $M'(\lambda)\to M(\lambda)$, induced from the surjection $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{x})\to\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$. See [11] for the proof of the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. (1) *The kernel of $M'(\lambda)\to M(\lambda)$ is spanned by elements of the form*

$$f'_{i_1}\cdots f'_{i_k}\theta^-_{ij}f'_{j_1}\cdots f'_{j_l}|\lambda\rangle.$$

(2) *The kernel $K(\lambda)$ of the natural surjection $M(\lambda)\to V(\lambda)$ whose kernel is generated as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module by the elements*

$$f_i^{1+\frac{2(\lambda,\alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)}}|\lambda\rangle, i=1,\dots,r.$$

Observe that for all j (including $j = i$)

$$e_j f_i^{1+\frac{2(\lambda,\alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)}}|\lambda\rangle = 0 \in M(\lambda).$$

For $j \neq i$, this is clear because then e_j commutes with f_i. For $j = i$, the computation reduces to the case of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$. In this case one notes that if $h|\lambda\rangle = m|\lambda\rangle$, then $ef^{m+1}|\lambda\rangle = (-m + (-m+2) + \cdots + (m-2) + m)|\lambda\rangle = 0$.

Proposition 4.1 implies that $K(\lambda)$ is spanned as a complex vector space by the elements of the form (where i, k and $i_1, \ldots, i_k$ are arbitrary):

$$f_{i_1} \ldots f_{i_k} f_i^{1+\frac{2(\lambda,\alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)}}|\lambda\rangle.$$

Writing $K'(\lambda)$ for the kernel of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{r}) = M'(\lambda) \to V(\lambda)$, we see that it is a left $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{r})$ module spanned (as a $\mathbb{C}$ vector space) by elements of the form

$$f'_{i_1} \cdots f'_{i_k} \theta^-_{ij} f'_{j_1} \cdots f'_{j_l}|\lambda\rangle,\ i \neq j,\ i = 1 \ldots, r, j = 1, \ldots r.$$

$$f'_{i_1} \cdots f'_{i_k} {f'}_i^{1+\frac{2(\lambda,\alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)}}|\lambda\rangle,\ i = 1, \ldots, r. \tag{4.1}$$

4.1. **Duals.** Let $M(\lambda)^*$ denote the vector space dual of $M(\lambda)$. This is canonically a $\mathfrak{g}$-module (we will not modify the natural $\mathfrak{g}$-structure). Note that if μ is a weight, there is a natural identification (similarly for $\mathfrak{g}'$)

$$(M(\lambda)^*)_{-\mu} \xrightarrow{\sim} (M(\lambda)_\mu)^*$$

(an element of $(M(\lambda)^*)_{-\mu}$ acts by zero on all elements $M(\lambda)_\nu$ for $\nu \neq \mu$, and for the reverse there is a natural direct sum $M(\lambda) = \oplus M(\lambda)_\nu$).

4.2. **Tensor products.** We now place ourselves in the setting of the introduction: $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N$ are dominant integral weights, and $\sum_{a=1}^{M} \beta(a) = \sum \lambda_i = \sum n_p \alpha_p = \mu$. Let $M = M(\lambda_1) \otimes M(\lambda_2) \otimes \ldots \otimes M(\lambda_N)$ and $V = V(\lambda_1) \otimes V(\lambda_2) \otimes \ldots \otimes V(\lambda_N)$. Similarly let $M' = M'(\lambda_1) \otimes M'(\lambda_2) \otimes \ldots \otimes M'(\lambda_N)$. There is a natural $\mathfrak{h}$-equivariant surjection $M' \to M$. Note that

$(M')_0$ has a basis indexed by $\mathcal{B}$ (defined in Section 3.3): to the data $(\vec{\delta}, \vec{k})$ associate the element $|w_1\rangle \otimes |w_2\rangle \ldots \otimes |w_N\rangle$ where

$$|w_j\rangle = f'_{\delta_j(1)} \otimes \ldots \otimes f'_{\delta_j(k_j)}|\lambda_j\rangle \in M'(\lambda).$$

There is a natural isomorphism due to Schechtman-Varchenko [10] (which coincides with equation (2.2), see Remark 6.2):

$$\Omega_\beta : (M')_0^* \to \Omega^M_{\log}(X_{\vec{z}})^{\epsilon,\Sigma}, \tag{4.2}$$

given by the formula

$$\Omega_\beta(\langle\Psi|) = \sum_{(\vec{\pi},\vec{k})} \langle\Psi|\vec{w}\rangle \wedge \Omega(\vec{\pi}, \vec{k}) \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$|w_j\rangle = f'_{\beta(\pi_j(1))} \otimes \ldots \otimes f'_{\beta(\pi_j(k_j))}|\lambda_j\rangle \in M'(\lambda),$$

$|\vec{w}\rangle = |w_1\rangle \otimes |w_2\rangle \ldots \otimes |w_N\rangle$ and $\Omega(\vec{\pi}, \vec{k})$ is as in (3.2).

Remark 4.2. *In* [10]*, Schechtman and Varchenko relate the Lie algebra homology of free Lie algebras and the cohomology (with local coefficients) of certain configuration spaces. The isomorphism* (4.2) *is a particular case of their work.*

Remark 4.3. *One can see that* Ω_β *is an isomorphism as follows.* M'_0 *and* $\Omega^M_{\log}(X_{\vec{z}})^{\epsilon,\Sigma}$ *each have basis parameterized by* $\mathcal{B}$ *(see Section 3.3). The mapping sends the basis dual to the chosen basis of* M'_0 *to the corresponding basis element of* $\Omega^M_{\log}(X_{\vec{z}})^{\epsilon,\Sigma}$*.*

5. THE MAIN THEOREMS

As stated in the introduction, our proof of Theorem 1.1 is broken into two parts.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is classical or* G_2*. Suppose* $\omega \in (H^{M,0}(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}, \mathbb{C}))^{\chi}$*. On* $Y_{\vec{z}}$*, express* ω *as a differential form* $\mathcal{R}p^*\Omega$ *where* $p : Y_{\vec{z}} \to X_{\vec{z}}$ *is the covering map. Then,* Ω *is a log-form on* $X_{\vec{z}}$*.*

From Theorem 5.1 and the Schechtman-Varchenko isomorphism (4.2) we can write any $\omega \in (H^{M,0}(\overline{Y}_{\vec{z}}, \mathbb{C}))^{\chi}$ in the form

$$\omega = \mathcal{R}\Omega(\langle\Psi|)$$

for some $\langle\Psi| \in (M')^*_0$. Therefore Theorem 1.1 will follow from the following:

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose* $\langle\Psi| \in (M')^*_0$ *is such that* $\mathcal{R}\Omega(\langle\Psi|)$ *is square integrable. Then* $\langle\Psi|$ *lies in the subspace* $V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z})) \subseteq (V_{\lambda_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes V_{\lambda_N})^* \subseteq (M'_0)^*$ *.*

We will prove Theorem 5.2 first, and return to the proof of Theorem 5.1 in Section 8.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.2

Suppose,

1. $|\vec{v}\rangle = |v_1\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |v_N\rangle$ where each $|v_i\rangle \in M'(\lambda_i)$,
2. $X : A \subseteq [M] \to \mathfrak{g}'$ with $X_a \in \mathfrak{x}$.
3. $\langle\Psi| \in (M'^*)_0$,

Definition 6.1. *Define* $\langle\Psi|\prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{v}\rangle = \langle\Psi|w(t,z)\rangle \prod_{a\in M} dt_a$*, with variables taken in ascending order in* $\prod_{a\in A} dt_a$ *and* $|w(t,z)\rangle \in M'(\lambda_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes M'(\lambda_N)$ *is given by the formula*

$$|w(t,z)\rangle = \sum_{part} \prod_{i=1}^{N} \langle\langle \prod_{a\in I_i} X_a(t_a)|v_i\rangle\rangle \tag{6.1}$$

with

$$\langle\langle X_{\gamma_1}(u_1)X_{\gamma_2}(u_2)\ldots X_{\gamma_q}(u_q)|v_i\rangle\rangle = \sum_{perm} \frac{1}{(u_1-u_2)(u_2-u_3)\ldots(u_q-z_i)}(X_{\gamma_1}\ldots X_{\gamma_q}|v_i\rangle) \in M'(\lambda_i)$$

and where $\sum_{part}$ *stands for the summation over all partitions of* A *into* N *disjoint parts* $A = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \cdots \cup I_N$ *and* $\sum_{perm}$ *the summation over all permutations of the elements of* $\{1,\ldots,q\}$*.*

Remark 6.2. *It is known that in the genus* 0 *situation, conformal blocks embed in the* $\mathfrak{g}$-*invariants in the dual of the tensor product* $(\otimes V_{\lambda_j})^*$ *(see* [16]*, Proposition 6.1). Suppose in the setting of Section 2,* $\langle\Psi| \in V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X}(\vec{z})) \subseteq (M)^*_0$*. In such a setting we have two definitions of*

$$\langle\Psi|f_{\beta(1)}(t_1)f_{\beta(2)}(t_2)\dots f_{\beta(M)}(t_M)|\vec{\lambda}\rangle$$

The two definitions are (1) as above, and (2) as a correlation function (see (2.2)*). These coincide, for a proof see Proposition 8.5 in* [2]*.*

We also note that

$$\Omega_\beta(\langle\Psi|) = \langle\Psi|f_{\beta(1)}(t_1)f_{\beta(2)}(t_2)\dots f_{\beta(M)}(t_M)|\vec{\lambda}\rangle$$

(compare equation (4.3) *with the above definition)*

6.1. **Residue formulas.** We examine the Poincaré residues of $\Omega_\beta(\langle\Psi|)$ to prove Theorem 5.2. If Ω is a meromorphic M-form on an algebraic variety Y which presents at most simple poles along a smooth divisor D, define $\operatorname{Res}_D \Omega$, a meromorphic $M-1$-form on D by setting (where f is a local defining equation for D)

$$\Omega = \Omega' \wedge \frac{df}{f}$$

$$\operatorname{Res}_D \Omega = \Omega'|D.$$

The locus $t_a = t_b$ in $\mathbb{C}^A$ will be parameterized by $\mathbb{C}^{A'}$ where $A' = A - \{a\}$ assuming $b < a$ ("keep the smaller variable"). The locus $t_a = z_j$, or $t_a = 0$ (or $t_a = \infty$ in $(\mathbb{P}^1)^A$) will be parameterized by $\mathbb{C}^{A'}$ (or $(\mathbb{P}^1)^{A'}$) where $A' = A - \{a\}$.

(1)
$$\langle\Psi|\prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{v}\rangle$$
is symmetric in t_a and t_b (up-to sign) if $X_a = X_b$.

(2) The residue of
$$\langle\Psi|\prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{v}\rangle$$
along $t_a = t_b$ with $b < a$ is a similar function (up to sign)
$$\langle\Psi|\prod_{c\in A'} X'_c(t_c)|\vec{v}\rangle$$
with $A' = A - \{a\}$ and $X'_b = [X_a, X_b]$ (and $X'_c = X_c$ for $c \neq \{a, b\}$).

(3) The residue of
$$\langle\Psi|\prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{v}\rangle$$
along $t_a = z_j$ is a similar function (up to sign)
$$\langle\Psi|\prod_{c\in A'} X'_c(t_c)|\vec{v'}\rangle$$
with $A' = A - \{a\}$ and $X'_c = X_c$, $\forall c \in A'$ and $|v'_i\rangle = |v_i\rangle$ for $i \neq j$ and $|v'_j\rangle = X_a|v_j\rangle$.

These formulas are consistent with the theory of correlation functions (see Remark 6.2).

6.2. **Square integrability.** Suppose $\langle\Psi| \in (M')_0^*$ is such that $\mathcal{R}\Omega(\langle\Psi|)$ is square integrable. The first observation is that Ω is regular at the generic point of each of the divisors $t_a = \infty$. This is because the order of $\mathcal{R}$ along the divisor $t_a = \infty$ is negative $(= -(\beta(a), \beta(a))/\kappa)$, therefore the logarithmic order of Ω along this stratum is ≥ 1 which implies that Ω is regular along the divisors $t_a = \infty$.

Now we begin to probe the square integrability assumptions along deeper strata. For simplicity, back in the original situation assume that $\beta(2) = \beta(3) = \cdots = \beta(-n_{ij} + 2) = \alpha_i$ and $\beta(1) = \alpha_j$.

By Lemma 8.1, we know that $\operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \operatorname{Res}_{t_3=t_1} \dots \operatorname{Res}_{t_{-n_{ij}+2}=t_1} \Omega = 0$. This implies that

$$\langle\Psi|\,\mathrm{ad}(f'_{\alpha_i})^{n_{ij}+1}(f'_{\alpha_j})(t_1) \prod_{a>-n_{ij}+2} f'_{\beta(a)}(t_a)|\vec{\lambda}\rangle = 0 \tag{6.2}$$

6.3. **Proof of Theorem 5.2, Part I.** Under the square integrability hypothesis we first prove $\langle\Psi| \in (M_0)^* \subseteq (M'_0)^*$.

The above formulas (formula (6.2) and Section 6.1) shows that $\langle\Psi|$ vanishes on any tensor $|w_1\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |w_N\rangle$ where *some* $|w_a\rangle$ is of the form

$$f'_{a_1} \dots f'_{a_k}\, \mathrm{ad}(f'_{\alpha_i})^{n_{ij}+1}(f'_{\alpha_j}) \dots f'_{a_{k+1}} \dots f'_{a_s} |\lambda_a\rangle$$

(we need consider only the case $|w_1\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |w_N\rangle \in M_0$, and we can use the description of M, M' in terms of universal enveloping algebras, see Proposition 4.1)

6.4. **Proof of Theorem 5.2, Part II.** Under the square integrability hypothesis we prove $\langle\Psi| \in V^* \subseteq (M_0)^*$.

We establish a preliminary statement. Let $n = \frac{2(\lambda_i,\alpha_p)}{(\alpha_p,\alpha_p)}$ for simplicity, back in the original situation assume that $\beta(1) = \beta(2) = \cdots = \beta(n+1) = \alpha_i$.

By Lemma 8.1, we know that $\operatorname{Res}_{t_1=z_j} \operatorname{Res}_{t_2=z_j} \dots \operatorname{Res}_{t_{n+1}=z_j} \Omega = 0$. The rest of the argument is as in Part I (see Expression (4.1)).

6.5. **Proof of Theorem 5.2, Part III.** Under the square integrability assumption $\langle\Psi| \in (V^*)^{\mathfrak{g}} \subseteq V^*$:

We will now show that $f_i\langle\Psi| = 0$ for all simple roots α_i. To show this let $\beta(1) = \alpha_i$. Residuate $t_2, \dots, t_M$ at $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N$ (in all possible ways). One gets a differential form in t_1 alone. The sum of its residues is zero (non-zero residues are possible only at $z_1, \dots, z_m$). This yields $f_i\langle\Psi| = 0$.

It follows that $\langle\Psi| \in (V^*)^{\mathfrak{g}}$ (To show that $e_i\langle\Psi| = 0$ for all i, we reduce to the case of $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$. It is then easy to see that the elements $e^m\langle\Psi|$ generate a $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule of $(V^*)_0$, all of whose weights are non-negative, the symmetry of weights forces these weights to be zero and hence $e\langle\Psi| = 0$).

6.6. **Proof of Theorem 5.2, Part IV.** It is known that $\langle\Psi| \in (V^*)^{\mathfrak{g}}$ lies in $V^{\dagger}_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X})$ if and only if

$$\langle\Psi|T^{k+1}|\vec{v}\rangle = 0,\ \forall\ |\vec{v}\rangle \in V_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\lambda_N}$$

where

$$T : V_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\lambda_N} \to V_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\lambda_N}$$

is given by the formula is the operator $\sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i f_\theta^{(i)}$ with $f_\theta^{(i)}$ acting on the ith position of a tensor product, see [1, 7] (note that it is immaterial whether we choose f_θ or e_θ.)

Suppose $\langle\Psi| \in (V^*)^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is such that $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ is square integrable. We will now show that $\langle\Psi|$ is actually in $V^\dagger_{\vec{\lambda}}(\mathfrak{X})$. Our task therefore, considering the previous paragraph, is to show that for any maps $\delta_j : [l_j] \to [r]$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$, defining

$$|v_j\rangle = f'_{\delta_j(1)} \dots \otimes f'_{\delta_j(k_j)}|\lambda_j\rangle \in V_\lambda, \tag{6.3}$$

one has

$$\langle\Psi|T^{k+1}|v_1\rangle \otimes |v_2\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |v_N\rangle = 0 \tag{6.4}$$

we note that (6.4) is zero unless

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{\ell=1}^{l_j} \delta_j(\ell) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_j - (k+1)\theta.$$

We will therefore assume that $\sum \lambda_i - (k+1)\theta$ is a sum of simple positive roots.

By residuation (if possible i.e. if $\sum \lambda_i - (k+1)\theta$ is 0 or a sum of positive simple roots) arrive at a correlation function

$$\langle\Psi| \prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{\lambda}\rangle$$

1. $X_1 = X_2 = \dots = X_{k+1} = f_\theta$ where θ is the highest root in $\mathfrak{g}$, and X_j is in the weight space corresponding to negatives of simple roots for $j > k+1$).
2. $|\vec{\lambda}\rangle = |\lambda_1\rangle \otimes |\lambda_2\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\lambda_N\rangle$ where $|\lambda_j\rangle \in V_j$ is the highest weight vector.

We claim that

$$\langle\Psi| \prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{v}\rangle$$

has no poles when $t_a = t_b$ for $a, b \in [k+1], a \neq b$ and vanishes when $t_1 = \dots = t_{k+1} = \infty$. Let $\{t_a : a \in B\}$ be the set of variables which residuate to $t_1, \dots, t_{k+1}$.

The first part follows from $[f_\theta, f_\theta] = 0$ (so the residue at $t_a = t_b$ is zero). To prove the second part assume that $\langle\Psi| \prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{v}\rangle$ does not vanish on the stratum $t_1 = \dots = t_{k+1} = \infty$. Then by Lemma 7.6 the logarithmic order of Ω on the stratum $t_b = \infty, \forall b \in B$ is $\leq k+1$.

The logarithmic order of $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ is, on this stratum, (look at calculations at infinity, $m = k+1$, see formulas from [2] on stratum $(S3)$)

$$\leq m - \frac{m^2}{\kappa} - \frac{2m(g^*-1)}{2\kappa}$$

which is $\frac{m}{\kappa}$ times $\kappa - m - (g^* - 1) = 0$, a contradiction to square integrability. (See [2]: equation (6.4), and the proof (there) of Lemma 6.1).

Now residuate the variables $t_j, j > k+1$ in

$$\langle\Psi| \prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{\lambda}\rangle$$

to arrive at a correlation function

$$\Omega'(t_1, \dots, t_{k+1}) = \langle\Psi| \prod_{a\in A} X_a(t_a)|\vec{v}\rangle$$

where $A = \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ and $X_a = f_\theta$ for all $a \in A$ and $|\vec{v}\rangle = |v_1\rangle \otimes |v_2\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |v_N\rangle$ where $|v_j\rangle \in V_j$ is as in (6.3). It is easy to see this new correlation function vanishes when $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_{k+1} = \infty$ (this requires a small argument in the style of Lemma 18.1).We will now show that the desired vanishing (6.4) holds.

Note that $\Omega'(t_1, \dots, t_{k+1})$ is a differential form with singularities only at $t_a = z_i$ and vanishes at $t_1 = \cdots = t_{k+1} = \infty$. The sum of residues in t_1 of the meromorphic form $t_1\Omega(t_1, \dots, t_{k+1})$ is zero. Its singularities are in the set $\{z_1, \dots, z_N, \infty\}$. Let $u_i = \frac{1}{t_i}$ to facilitate computations at infinity. Write $\Omega'(t_1, \dots, t_{k+1}) = f(t_1, \dots, t_{k+1}) du_1 \wedge du_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge du_{k+1}$. We obtain

$$f(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k, \infty) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathrm{Res}_{t_{k+1}=z_i}\, t_{k+1}\Omega'(t_1, \dots, t_{k+1})$$

and iterating this, we obtain

$$0 = f(\infty, \infty, \dots, \infty) = (-1)^{k+1} \prod_{a=1}^{k+1} \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathrm{Res}_{t_a=z_i} \Big) t_1 t_2 \cdots t_{k+1} \Omega'(t_1, \dots, t_{k+1})$$

which immediately implies the desired equality (6.4).

7. Lowest degree terms and logarithmic degrees along various strata

Let $Q(t_1, \dots, t_M)$ be a rational function in $t_1, \dots, t_M$ with poles only along the diagonals of the form $t_a = t_b$ and $t_a = z_j$, with $j = 1, \dots, N$ (with M arbitrary in this section) and let S be the stratum $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L$.

We multiply Q by an factor $\mathcal{P} = \prod_{1 \le a < b \le L} (t_a - t_b)^{n_{a,b}}$, to get a polynomial $\widetilde{Q}$ which is holomorphic (generically) on S, where $n_{a,b} \geq 0$. Let $u_a = t_a - t_1$ for $1 < a \leq L$. We expand $\widetilde{Q}$ as power series with coefficients in the function field $K(S)$ of S.

$$\widetilde{Q} = \sum_{d \geq d_0} g_d(u_2, \cdots, u_L).$$

Note that we made a choice of a variable t_1 from the set $\{t_1, \dots, t_L\}$. Here g_d is a homogeneous polynomial in the $u_a' s$ with coefficients in $K(S)$ with total degree d and d_0 is the smallest number such that $g_{d_0} \neq 0$. Thus we can rewrite Q as follows

$$Q = \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{d \geq d_0} g_d(u_2, \cdots, u_L). \tag{7.1}$$

Definition 7.1. *We refer to* $\frac{g_{d_0}(u_2, \cdots, u_L)}{\mathcal{P}}$ *as the lowest degree term of* Q *and* $d_0 - \deg(\mathcal{P})$ *as the degree of* Q *on the stratum* S. *We also refer to* $\mathcal{P}$ *as a correction factor of* Q *on the stratum* S.

Remark 7.2. *Suppose* S *is the stratum* $t_1 = \cdots = t_L = z_1$. *We can repeat the above definitions of degree, lowest degree term and correction factors: We multiply* Ω *by* $\mathcal{P} = \prod_{1 \le a < b \le L} (t_a - t_b)^{n_{a,b}} \prod_{1 \le a \le L} (t_a - z_1)^{n_a}$ *to get a function* $\widetilde{Q}$ *holomorphic on the generic point of* S. *We then expand* $\widetilde{Q}$ *in powers of* $t_1 - z_1, t_2 - z_1, t_3 - z_1, \dots, t_L - z_1$.

7.1. **Some remarks on the lowest degree term.** Let $K = \mathbb{C}((t))$, and let $\sigma : \mathbb{C}((t_1)) \to K$ be the isomorphism which takes t_1 to t. Therefore $h_d(u_2, \ldots, u_n) = \sigma g_d(u_2, \ldots, u_n)$ is a polynomial in $u_2, \ldots, u_n$ with coefficients in $K' = K(t_{L+1}, \ldots, t_M)$. Consider $h_d = g_d(t_2 - t_1, \ldots, t_n - t_1)$. Therefore h_d is a polynomial with coefficients in K' in $t_1, \ldots, t_L$. Note that d_0 and h_d may (a priori) depend upon the choice of the "initial variable" t_1.

Lemma 7.3. *The lowest degree and the lowest degree terms have the following properties:*

1. *The lowest coefficient d_0, and the corresponding polynomial $h_{d_0} \in K'[t_1, \ldots, t_L]$ are independent of the choice of the initial variable t_1.*
2. *If Q is symmetric in t_1, t_2, then so is h_{d_0}.*
3. *Suppose Q has no poles along $t_i = t_j$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, L'\}$ and vanishes on $t_1 = \cdots = t_{L'}$, then so does h_{d_0} (here $L' < L$).*

7.2. **Logarithmic degree of meromorphic forms.** Let Ω be a top-degree meromorphic form on $\mathbb{A}^M$ such that Ω has poles only along the diagonals of the form $t_a = t_b$. Write $\Omega = Q(t_1, \ldots, t_M)\vec{dt}$. Let m be the degree of Q on the stratum $S : t_1 = \cdots = t_L$. Then the logarithmic degree $d^S(\Omega)$ of Ω along S equals $m + L - 1$. We will call the lowest degree term of Q on S also as the lowest degree term of Ω on S.

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose Ω has a simple pole along $t_1 = t_2$ and that the lowest degree term of Ω is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_2$. Then the following holds*

$$d^S(\Omega) < d^{S^*}(\operatorname*{Res}_{t_1=t_2} \Omega),$$

where S and S^* are the strata $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L$ and $t_1 = t_3 = t_4 = \cdots = t_L$ respectively.

We note the following lemmas.

Lemma 7.5. *Suppose Ω has a simple pole along $t_1 = t_2$ which also appears as a pole of the lowest degree term. Then the following holds*

$$d^S(\Omega) = d^{S^*}(\operatorname*{Res}_{t_1=t_2} \Omega),$$

where S and S^* are the stratum $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L$ and $t_1 = t_3 = t_4 = \cdots = t_L$ respectively.

Lemma 7.6. *Suppose that Ω has a simple pole along $t_1 = t_2$ (resp. $t_1 = z_1$). Then,*

$$d^S(\Omega) \leq d^{S^*}(\Omega^*),$$

where S is the stratum $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L$ (resp. $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L = z_1$), Ω^* is the form $\operatorname{Res}_{t_1=t_2} \Omega$ (resp. $\operatorname{Res}_{t_1=z_1} \Omega$) and S^* is the stratum $t_2 = t_3 = t_4 = \cdots = t_L$ (resp. $t_2 = \cdots = t_L = z_1$).

Let us study the holomorphicity of the lowest degree term of Ω under residuation. The following lemma tells us that no new poles are created in the lowest degree term along any diagonal if we residuate along poles of the lowest degree term.

Lemma 7.7. *Suppose Ω has a simple pole along $t_2 = t_3$. Further assume that the lowest degree term of Ω is holomorphic (generically) along $t_1 = t_2$, $t_1 = t_3$ and has a pole along $t_2 = t_3$. Then the lowest degree term of $\operatorname{Res}_{t_3=t_2} \Omega$ is also holomorphic (generically) along $t_1 = t_2$.*

We end this section with a definition.

Definition 7.8. *Let $J = (j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_k)$ be an ordered subset of $[M]$ and m be the minimum in J. Let $K = ([M]\backslash J) \cup \{m\}$. We define $\mathrm{Res}_{\vec{J}}\Omega$ to be a form on $\mathbb{A}^K$ obtained from taking iterated residues of Ω along $t_m = t_a$ where $a \in J\backslash\{m\}$ following the order of the set J $\{m\}$ starting from the lowest.*

8. The first step

Let Ω be any M-form on $X_{\vec{z}}$.

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ is square integrable.*

1. *If $a \neq b \in [M]$, then Ω has at most a simple pole along $t_a = t_b$.*
2. *If $(\beta(a), \beta(b)) \geq 0$ for $a \neq b \in [M]$, then Ω does not have a pole along $t_a = t_b$.*
3. *Ω does not have a pole along $t_a = \infty$ for any $a \in [M]$.*
4. *Ω has at most a simple pole at $t_a = z_i$ for any i.*
5. *Suppose (after possibly changing β) that $\beta(1) = \cdots = \beta(m) = \alpha$ and $\widetilde{\Omega} = \prod_{a=1}^m (t_a - z_j)\Omega$. Then $\widetilde{\Omega}$ vanishes at the generic point of $t_1 = \cdots = t_m = z_j$ if $m \geq 1 + \frac{2(\lambda_j,\alpha)}{(\alpha,\alpha)}$.*
6. *Suppose (after possibly changing β) that $\beta(1) = \cdots = \beta(m) = \alpha$, $\beta(m+1) = \alpha'$, and $\widetilde{\Omega} = \prod_{a=1}^m (t_a - t_{m+1})\Omega$. Then $\widetilde{\Omega}$ vanishes at the generic point of $t_1 = \cdots = t_m = t_{m+1}$ if $m \geq 1 - \frac{2(\beta,\alpha)}{(\alpha,\alpha)}$.*

Proof. Consider the stratum $t_a = t_b$. The logarithmic degree of Ω plus the quantity $\frac{-(\beta(a),\beta(b))}{\kappa}$ is positive. This immediately tells us that Ω has a poles of order at most one along $t_a = t_b$, and if the poles of order 1 then $(\beta(a), \beta(b)) < 0$. This gives us part 1 and 2 of the lemma. The proof of (4) follows in the same way by considering the stratum $t_a = z_i$.

Since the order of $\mathcal{R}$ along the divisor $t_a = \infty$ is negative $= -(\beta(a), \beta(a))/\kappa$, therefore the logarithmic order of Ω along this stratum is ≥ 1 which implies that Ω is regular along the divisor $t_a = \infty$. This proves (3).

For (5) we consider the stratum S defined by $t_1 = \cdots = t_m = z_j$. The logarithmic degree of $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ is positive. Thus we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} d^S(\Omega) - \sum_{1\leq a<b\leq m} \frac{\beta(a), \beta(b)}{\kappa} + \sum_{a=1}^{m} \frac{(\lambda_j, \beta(a))}{\kappa} &> 0 \\ d^S(\Omega) - \frac{m(m-1)}{2}.\frac{(\alpha,\alpha)}{\kappa} + m\frac{(\lambda_j,\alpha)}{\kappa} &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

If $m \geq 1 + \frac{2(\lambda_j,\alpha)}{(\alpha,\alpha)}$, then $d^S(\Omega) > 0$ which implies $\widetilde{\Omega}$ vanishes on the stratum S. The proof of (6) is similar to (5). ☐

Remark 8.2. *To prove Theorem 5.1, we use Proposition 3.2. For Ω as in the statement of Theorem 5.1 and each stratum S of the form (S1) and (S2) we need to show that the logarithmic degree $d^S(\Omega) \geq 0$. The square integrability assumption tells us that $d^S(\mathcal{R}\Omega) > 0$. So one may hope that the degree of $\mathcal{R}$ on each stratum is non-positive. This is not the case.*

Our argument uses the square-integrability information from a select set of strata to build a "profile" of Ω *(Theorem 8.3), and then use this to prove that the logarithmic degree of* Ω *is non-negative on every stratum* S*.*

Assume now that $\mathfrak{g}$ is classical or G_2. We will prove the following property of the pole structure of Ω. Let $T = \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$. Consider an iterated residue

$$\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}} \Omega = \operatorname{Res}_{t_\ell = t_1} \operatorname{Res}_{t_{\ell-1}=t_1} \dots \operatorname{Res}_{t_3=t_1} \operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$$

Theorem 8.3. *Suppose* $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ *is square-integrable. Assume that* $\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}} \Omega \neq 0$*. Then,*

1. $\beta(1) + \cdots + \beta(\ell)$ *is a positive root.*
2. $\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}} \Omega$ *a form in* $(t_1, t_{\ell+1}, t_{\ell+2}, \dots, t_M)$ *has a simple pole along any of the sets* $t_1 = t_p, p > \ell$*.*
3. $\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}} \Omega$ *a form in* $(t_1, t_{\ell+1}, t_{\ell+2}, \dots, t_M)$ *has a simple pole along any of the sets* $t_1 = z_j$ *for* $j = 1, \dots, N$*.*

The following can be proved using Theorem 8.3 and Lemma 18.6.

Proposition 8.4. *Let* $I_1, \dots, I_n$ *be pairwise disjoint subsets of* $[M]$*. Let* $|I_j| = m_j$*. Assume that* $\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I_n}} \cdots \operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I_1}} \Omega \neq 0$*. Then,*

1. $\beta(j_1) + \cdots \beta(j_{m_j})$ *is a positive root for* $j = 1, \dots, n$*.*
2. *The form* $\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I_n}} \cdots \operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I_1}} \Omega$ *has at most simple poles along any of the sets* $t_{n_1} = t_a$ *where* $a \in [M] \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{N} I_j$ *and along the sets* $t_{j_1} = z_i$ *for* $j = 1, \dots, n$ *and* $i = 1, \dots, N$*.*

Given Theorem 8.3 we will now prove Theorem 5.1. Let $\omega = \mathcal{R}\Omega$ be as in the statement of this theorem. We need to show that the logarithmic degree of Ω along any stratum of the form $(S1)$ or $(S2)$ is non-negative. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_n$ be a set positive simple roots of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of rank n. Our proof will follow a sequence of residues.

1. We always take residues along poles of a suitable lowest degree term of a form for a given stratum. Then Lemma 7.5 tells us that the logarithmic degree does not change after taking residues.
2. The pole structure of $\operatorname{Res}_{t_4=t_3} \operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$ as t_3 approaches some other variable can be controlled by the pole structure of $\operatorname{Res}_{t_4=t_3} \Omega$, where t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4 are coordinates in $\mathbb{A}^M$.
3. If the lowest degree term of Ω for a given stratum S defined by $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L$ is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_a$ for $a \in \{2, \cdots, L\}$, then the lowest degree term of $\operatorname{Res}_{t_b=t_a} \Omega$ for the new stratum S^* remains holomorphic along $t_1 = t_a$, where S^* is obtained by removing t_b from the stratum S and $a, b \in \{2, 3, \cdots, M\}$.

We break up the proof into several steps. Let $S = S_1$ be a stratum of the form $t_1 = \cdots = t_L$ (a stratum of type $(S1)$).

8.1. **Step I.** Let $\beta(1) = \alpha_1$ and assume that Ω has a pole along $t_1 = t_2$ and $(t_1 - t_2)$ does not divide the lowest degree term of Ω for the stratum S. We take a residue along $t_1 = t_2$ to get a form $\operatorname{Res}_{t_1=t_2} \Omega$ and a new stratum S_2 defined by $t_1 = t_3 = \cdots = t_L$. Lemma 7.5 tells us $d^S(\Omega) = d^{S_2}(\operatorname{Res}_{t_1=t_2} \Omega)$. By Theorem 8.3, we know that $\operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$ has at most simple poles as t_1 approaches the remaining variables t_a for $a = 3, \dots, L$.

8.2. **Step II.** We continue taking residues with the new form $\operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\Omega$ and the same variable t_1 along the stratum S_2. The simplicity of the poles of along $t_1 = t_a$ where t_a is any remaining variable is guaranteed by Theorem 8.3. When we cannot residuate further we get a form $\Omega_k = \operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}}\Omega$ and a stratum S_k, where T denotes the ordered set of variables that got together during the residuation process. The lowest degree term of $\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}}\Omega$ for the stratum S_k does not have a pole along $t_1 = t_a$ where $a \in [L]\backslash T$. Also Lemma 7.5 tells us $d^S(\Omega) = d^{S_k}(\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}}\Omega)$. Let $b, c \in [L]\backslash T$, then the pole structure of $\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}}\Omega$ along $t_b = t_c$ is controlled by the poles structure of Ω along $t_b = t_c$ as in Theorem 8.3.

8.3. **Step III.** We repeat Step I, Step II to the form Ω_k and the stratum S_k starting with a new variable. We keep taking residues along diagonals of the form $t_a = t_b$ unless all variables of all colors are exhausted. At the end we get a form Ω_n and a stratum S_n such that the lowest degree term of Ω_n for the stratum S_n is holomorphic. Then by Lemma 7.5, we get $d^S(\Omega) = d^{S_n}(\Omega_n)$. Thus $d^S(\Omega) \geq 0$.

The proof that the logarithmic degree along any stratum of type ($S2$): $t_1 = \cdots = t_L = z_1$ is non-negative follows similarly. Note that we *do not* take residues along $t_k = z_1$. At the last step we will have set of surviving t variables. There are no poles in the lowest degree term when two of these variables are set together, and only (at most) a simple pole as one of them is set equal to z_1 (Theorem 8.4, (2)). The logarithmic degree is easily seen to be non-negative.

8.4. **Some reductions in Theorem 8.3.** We will show that (3) of Theorem 8.3 is immediate from (1), (2) and some Lie algebra considerations. Consider the stratum $S : t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_L = z_1$. Our square-integrability assumption implies that $d^S(\mathcal{R}\Omega) > 0$, and $d^S(\Omega) \leq d^{S'}(\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}}\Omega)$ (by Lemmas 7.4, 7.5) with S' the stratum $t_1 = z_1$. Let $\gamma = \sum_{a=1}^{\ell}\beta(a)$.

Now

$$0 < d^S(\mathcal{R}\Omega) = \frac{(\lambda_1, \gamma)}{\kappa} - \sum_{1\leq a<b\leq L}\frac{(\beta(a), \beta(b))}{\kappa} + d^S(\Omega)$$

Using $(\lambda, \gamma) \leq k$ (since γ is a root and λ_1 is of level k) and Lemma 8.5 below, we see that from the above inequality, one gets

$$0 < \frac{k + g^*}{\kappa} + d^S(\Omega) = 1 + d^S(\Omega) \leq 1 + d^{S'}(\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}}\Omega).$$

Therefore $d^{S'}(\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}}\Omega) > -1$ and this proves (3).

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a simple complex Lie algebra, g^* be the dual Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$. Consider a positive root $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i$ where δ_i are positive simple roots possibly repeated, then the following inequality holds:*

$$\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq n}(\delta_i, \delta_j) > -g^*$$

Proof. This can be proved by a direct calculation. □

The following will be used to simplify verification of (1) and (2) in Theorem 8.3. Suppose $\Omega' = \operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}}\Omega$ is as in Theorem 8.3 and $p > \ell$. Let S be the stratum $t_1 = \cdots = t_\ell = t_p$.

Proposition 8.6. (1) *If $d^S(\Omega) > 0$, or equivalently the degree of Ω on S is $> -\ell$ then Ω' does not have a pole along $t_1 = t_p$.*

(2) *If* $d^S(\Omega) \geq 0$, *or equivalently the degree of* Ω *on* S *is* $\geq -\ell$ *then* Ω' *has at most a simple pole along* $t_1 = t_p$.
(3) *If* $\mathcal{R}\Omega$ *is square integrable and* $\beta(1) + \cdots + \beta(\ell) + \beta(p)$ *is a positive root, then* Ω' *has at most a simple pole along* $t_1 = t_p$.

Proof. Use the inequality $d^S(\Omega) \leq d^{S'}(\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}} \Omega)$ (by Lemmas 7.4, 7.5) where S' is the stratum $t_1 = t_p$. This shows (1) and (2).

For (3), we have $d^S(\mathcal{R}\Omega) > 0$. Set $p = \ell + 1$ and

$$0 < d^S(\mathcal{R}\Omega) = d^S(\Omega) - \sum_{1 \leq a < b \leq \ell+1} \frac{(\beta(a), \beta(b))}{\kappa} < d^S(\Omega) + \frac{g^*}{\kappa}$$

So $d^S(\Omega) > -\frac{g^*}{\kappa}$, and hence $d^S(\Omega) \geq 0$ and we can use (2). $\square$

Therefore, to prove Theorem 8.3, we need to prove the following (under the assumption of square-integrability)

Proposition 8.7. *Assume* $\beta(1) + \cdots + \beta(\ell)$ *is a positive root and* $\beta(1) + \cdots + \beta(\ell) + \beta(p)$ *is not a* positive *root. Then,* $\Omega' = \operatorname{Res}_{\vec{T}} \Omega$ *is regular along* $t_1 = t_p$.

The rest of the proof of Theorem 8.3 is case by case. We will use the Bourbaki notation for Lie algebras.

9. Theorem 8.3 for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2), \mathfrak{sl}(3)$.

The case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ is immediate, because (by Lemma 8.1) there are no poles at $t_a = t_b$ and at most a simple pole at $t_a = z_i$.

In this section we give a proof of Theorem 8.3 for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(3)$. Let α_1, α_2 (the non-simple root is $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$) denote the positive simple roots. Suppose $\beta(1) = \alpha_1$ and $\beta(2) = \alpha_2$.

Proposition 9.1. *The form* $\Omega' = \operatorname{Res}_{t_2 = t_1} \Omega$ *in* $t_1, t_3, \ldots, t_M$, *has no poles as* $t_1 = t_a$ *for any* $a \in \{3, \ldots, M\}$.

Proof. Suppose $\beta(3) = \alpha_2$. Then $\widetilde{\Omega} = (t_1 - t_2)(t_1 - t_3)\Omega$ is holomorphic at the generic point of $t_1 = t_2$, and that of $t_1 = t_3$ (also $t_2 = t_3$); and vanishes at $t_1 = t_2 = t_3$ by Lemma 8.1. Therefore $\Omega' = \frac{\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_1, t_3)}{(t_1 - t_3)}$ which is regular at $t_1 = t_3$. The proof when $\beta(3) = \alpha_1$ is similar. $\square$

10. The case $\mathfrak{g} = A_n = \mathfrak{sl}(n+1)$

In this section we prove Theorem 8.3 for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(n+1)$. We will follow the pattern of the case $\mathfrak{sl}(3)$. The simple roots are $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ and the positive roots are of the form $\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} + \cdots + \alpha_j$, where $i < j$. We will have variables $t_1, \ldots, t_M$ colored by the simple roots $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$. Suppose $t_1, \ldots, t_\ell$ have colors $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\ell$, for some $\ell \leq n$. Then we want to prove the following:

Proposition 10.1. *The form*

$$\Omega' = \operatorname{Res}_{t_\ell = t_1} \cdots \operatorname{Res}_{t_3 = t_1} \operatorname{Res}_{t_2 = t_1} \Omega$$

has poles along $t_1 = t_p$ *only if* $\ell \leq n - 1$ *and* $\beta(p) = \alpha_{\ell+1}$. *(In this case the pole is simple by Proposition 8.6).*

Proof. The proof is by induction on ℓ, for $\ell = 1$ (there is no residuation), the statement is just that Ω has poles along $t_1 = t_p$ only if the color of p is α_2 ($(\alpha_1, \alpha_p) = 0$ if $p \geq 2$).

10.1. **The case $\ell = 2$.** Let $\Omega' = \operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\Omega$. The proof that Ω' does not have a pole at $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ is similar to the $\mathfrak{sl}(3)$ case.

Let $\beta(p) \neq \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$, then Ω is holomorphic at the generic point of $t_1 = t_p$ and also at the generic point of $t_2 = t_p$. Thus by Lemma 18.1 Ω' cannot have a pole $t_1 = t_p$.

10.2. **The case $\ell = 3$.** Suppose $\beta(p) \neq \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$, using the inductive step we know that $\operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\Omega$ has no poles as $t_1 = t_p$ and $t_3 = t_p$. Hence by Lemma 18.1, we get Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

10.2.1. *The case when $\beta(p) = \alpha_2$.* We will now show that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_2$. Consider $\widetilde{\Omega} = (t_1 - t_2)(t_2 - t_3)(t_1 - t_p)(t_p - t_3)\Omega(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_p)$ which is regular at the generic point of $t_1 = t_2 = t_3 = t_p$. Lemma 8.1, (6) tells us that $\widetilde{\Omega}(t, t, t_3, t)$ and $\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t, t, t)$ are both equal to zero.

We consider $\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t, t_3, t)$ which vanishes when $t = t_1$ and $t = t_3$ and is hence divisible by $(t - t_1)(t - t_3)$ (i.e. the quotient is holomorphic at the generic point of $t = t_1 = t_3$). For comfort, one may multiply by appropriate correction factors and view $\widetilde{\Omega}$ as a polynomial in the variables t_i. At this point we view $\widetilde{\Omega}$ as a function (i.e. divide by $dt_1 \dots dt_M$)

Next, look at

$$\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_p) - \widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, \frac{t_2 + t_p}{2}, t_3, \frac{t_2 + t_p}{2})$$

which vanishes at $t_2 = t_p$ and symmetric in t_2, t_p and is hence divisible by $(t_2 - t_p)^2$. We may therefore write

$$\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_p) = (t_1 - t_p)^2(A) - (\frac{t_2 + t_p}{2} - t_1)(\frac{t_2 + t_p}{2} - t_3)(B).$$

The residue $\Omega' = \frac{\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_1, t_1, t_p)}{(t_1 - t_p)^2}$ and by the previous equation, the numerator vanishes at $t_1 = t_p$ to the second order. Thus Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

10.2.2. *The case when $\beta(p) = \alpha_3$.* We will show that Ω' does not have any poles as $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_3$. Consider $\widetilde{\Omega} = (t_2 - t_p)(t_2 - t_3)(t_1 - t_2)\Omega(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_p)$. Lemma 8.1 implies $\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t, t, t) = 0$. Hence we can conclude that $\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_2, t, t)$ is divisible by $(t - t_2)$. Now as before we look at

$$\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_p) - \widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_2, \frac{t_3 + t_p}{2}, \frac{t_3 + t_p}{2})$$

which vanishes at $t_3 = t_p$ and is symmetric in t_3 and t_p. Thus we can write

$$\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_p) = (t_p - t_3)^2(A) + (\frac{t_3 + t_p}{2} - t_2)(B).$$

Thus $\Omega' = \frac{\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1, t_1, t_1, t_p)}{(t_1 - t_p)}$ is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

10.3. **The case of arbitrary ℓ.** By induction assume that the proposition is true for $\ell - 1$.

Let Ω' be the iterated residue $\operatorname{Res}_{t_\ell=t_1} \cdots \operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\Omega$. Lemma 18.1 ensures that whenever $\beta(p) \neq \{\alpha_{(\ell-1)}, \alpha_\ell, \alpha_{(\ell+1)}\}$ the form Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

Consider the case when $\beta(p) = \{\alpha_{(\ell-1)}, \alpha_\ell\}$. Using the same techniques as in the proof of the proposition for the case $\ell = 3$ and $\beta(p) = \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$, we can show that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

□

The proof of Theorem 8.3 for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(n+1)$ is now complete.

Remark 10.2. *Our proof assumes that t_1 is colored by the simple root α_1. The same argument works even if t_1 is colored by any α_i, as long as all (subsequent) roots are to the "right" of α_i. Since this is the case required for our main argument, we will not write out the argument for the remaining cases.*

Remark 10.3. *In every step of the proof of Proposition 10.1 we were reduced to checking two key things. We only needed to guarantee that at any stage the iterated residue is holomorphic along a variable which has the color of the last two roots added. All other cases were handled by Lemma 18.1. This reduction will also be used in the remaining cases.*

11. The case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{G}_2$

The positive simple roots of G_2 are α_1 and α_2. The other positive roots are $\alpha_1+\alpha_2$, $2\alpha_1+\alpha_2$, $3\alpha_1+\alpha_2$ and $3\alpha_1+2\alpha_2$. The normalized Cartan Killing form is given by $(\alpha_1,\alpha_1) = \frac{2}{3}$, $(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) = -1$ and $(\alpha_2,\alpha_2) = 2$.

One can form the "patterns" of positive roots starting from α_1, where at each step, one adds a simple root so that the sum is again a positive root. The only possible such pattern is $\alpha_1, \alpha_1+\alpha_2$, $2\alpha_1+\alpha_2$, $3\alpha_1+\alpha_2$ and $3\alpha_1+2\alpha_2$.

Let $\beta(1) = \alpha_1$. We will show Proposition 8.7 in this case. The cases $\ell \leq 2$ are easy and immediate.

11.1. The case $\ell = 3$.

Assume $\beta(1) = \alpha_1$, $\beta(2) = \alpha_2$, $\beta(3) = \alpha_2$ and $\beta(p) = \alpha_2$. Let $\widetilde{\Omega} = (t_1-t_2)(t_1-t_p)(t_3-t_p)(t_3-t_2)\Omega$. Clearly

$$\Omega' = \frac{\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1,t_1,t_1,t_p)}{(t_1-t_p)^2}$$

Now $\widetilde{\Omega}$ is symmetric in t_2 and t_p and vanishes at $t_2 = t_p = t_1$ or at $t_2 = t_p = t_3$. By the same argument as in Section 10.2.1, we can see that

$$\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1,t_2,t_3,t_p) = (t_2-t_p)^2 A + (\frac{t_2+t_p}{2} - t_1)((\frac{t_2+t_p}{2} - t_2)B$$

and this shows that one can pull a $(t_1-t_p)^2$ out of $\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1,t_1,t_1,t_p)$ as desired.

11.2. The case $\ell = 4$.

In this case by our previous arguments, $\beta(1) = \beta(3) = \beta(4) = \alpha_1$ and $\beta(2) = \alpha_2$. Consider the form $\Omega' = \mathrm{Res}_{t_4=t_1}\mathrm{Res}_{t_3=t_1}\mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\Omega$. We will show that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_1$.

We multiply Ω by a correction factor $\mathcal{P} = (t_1-t_2)(t_3-t_2)(t_4-t_2)(t_p-t_2)$ for the stratum $t_1 = t_2 = t_3 = t_4 = t_p$ and get a form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. Lemma 8.1 tells us that $\widetilde{\Omega}$ vanishes on $t_1 = t_2 = t_3 = t_4 = t_p$. Let $w = \frac{t_1+t_3+t_4+t_p}{4}$. Now $\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1,\cdots,t_4,t_p) - \widetilde{\Omega}(w,t_2,w,w,w)$ is symmetric in t_1, t_3, t_4, t_p and vanishes on $t_1 = t_3 = t_4 = t_p$.

By Lemma 15.1 we can rewrite $\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1,\ldots,t_p)$ as a sum of terms of the form $(t_i-t_j)^2 \cdot A_{ij}$ and $\widetilde{\Omega}(w,t_2,w,w,w)$, where $i,j \in \{1,3,4,p\}$. Since $(w-t_2)$ divides $\widetilde{\Omega}(w,t_2,w,w,w)$, we get that (t_1-t_p) divides $\widetilde{\Omega}(t_1,t_1,t_1,t_1,t_p)$. Hence Ω' has no poles as $t_1 = t_p$ and $\beta(p) = \alpha_1$.

11.3. The case when $\ell = 5$.

Let $\beta(5) = \alpha_2$.

11.3.1. *The case when* $\beta(p) = \alpha_1$. The correction factor is $\mathcal{P} = (t_p - t_2)(t_p - t_5)(t_4 - t_5)(t_3 - t_5)(t_1 - t_5)(t_4 - t_2)(t_3 - t_2)(t_1 - t_2)\Omega$ for the stratum $t_1 = t_2 = t_3 = t_4 = t_5 = t_p$. The form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ is symmetric in t_1, t_3, t_4, t_p and in t_2, t_5. Lemma 8.1 tells us that $\widetilde{\Omega}$ vanishes along the partial diagonals of the form $t_1 = t_3 = t_4 = t_p = t_2$(4 of color α_1 and one of color α_2) and of the form $t_2 = t_5 = t_1$ (2 of color α_2 and 1 of color α_1). By Lemma 15.3 and Lemma 7.3, $\widetilde{\Omega}$ has degree at least 4 on the stratum $S : t_1 = \cdots = t_5 = t_p$. Therefore the logarithmic degree of Ω on the stratum S is at least $4 - 8 + 5 > 0$. Using Proposition 8.6, Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

11.3.2. *The case when* $\beta(p) = \alpha_2$. We multiply Ω by a correction factor $\mathcal{P}$ for the stratum $S : t_1 = \cdots = t_5 = t_p$ of degree 9 to get a form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. The form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ vanishes on partial diagonals of the form $t_2 = t_5 = t_1$(2 of color α_2 and one of color α_1). By Lemma 15.2 and Lemma 7.3 the degree of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ on S is at least 5, and hence $d^S(\Omega) \geq 5 - 9 + 5 = 1$. Using Proposition 8.6, Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

12. THE CASE $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{B}_n$

The positive simple roots are $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$. The positive roots of B_n are of the form $\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} + \cdots + \alpha_n$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$; $(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} + \cdots + \alpha_n) + (\alpha_j + \alpha_{j+1} + \cdots + \alpha_n)$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$; $\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} + \cdots + \alpha_{j-1}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. The highest root is $\theta = \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + \cdots + 2\alpha_n$. The only possible "pattern" of positive roots starting at α_1 is $\alpha_1, (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2), \ldots, (\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n), (\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{(n-1)} + 2\alpha_n), \ldots, (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + \cdots + 2\alpha_n), (\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + \cdots + 2\alpha_n)$.

The normalized Cartan killing form is given by $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = 2$ for $1 \leq i < n$; $(\alpha_n, \alpha_n) = 1$; $(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}) = 0$ for $1 \leq i < n$ and $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = 0$ for $j > i + 1$.

Let $\beta(1) = \alpha_1$. We will now show Proposition 8.7 in this case. We divide the proof into several cases. When $\ell = 1$, there are no residues and Lemma 8.1 tells us that Ω has at most simple poles $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_2$.

12.1. **The case** $\ell \leq n$**.** The proof in this case is similar to the proof of Proposition 10.1.

12.2. **The case** $n < \ell \leq 2n - 2$**.** Let $\beta(n + m) = \alpha_{(n-m+1)}$ for $m > 0$. We prove the proposition in this case by induction on ℓ.

12.2.1. *The initial step.* When $\ell = n + 1$ by Lemma 18.1 and Proposition 8.6 we only need to consider the case when $\beta(p) = \alpha_n$. We multiply Ω by a correction factor $\mathcal{P}$ of degree $n+1$ for the stratum $t_1 = \cdots = t_{(n+1)} = t_p$ to get form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. By Lemma 8.1 the form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ vanishes along $t_{(n-1)} = t_n = t_{(n+1)} = t_p$. This completes the proof in this case.

12.2.2. *The inductive step.* Let $\ell = n + m$ and $T = \{1, 2, \ldots, n + m\}$. Assume by induction and Proposition 8.6 that for $m > 1$, the meromorphic form $\Omega'' = \operatorname{Res}_{\overline{T}} \Omega$ has at most simple poles along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m)}$. We will show that the form $\Omega' = \operatorname{Res}_{t_{(n+m+1)} = t_1} \Omega''$ is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) \neq \alpha_{(n-m-1)}$. The proof is broken up in the following steps:

Since Ω'' has poles along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m)}$. It is clear from Lemma 18.1 that Ω' is holomorphic at a generic point of $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) \neq \{\alpha_{(n-m-1)}, \alpha_{(n-m)}, \alpha_{(n-m+1)}\}$. By Proposition 8.6 we know that Ω' has at most simple poles along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m-1)}$

Now consider the case when $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m)}$. As before we multiply Ω by a correction factor $\mathcal{P}$ of degree $n + 3m + 3$ for the stratum S defined by $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_{(n+m+1)} = t_p$ to get a new form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. By Lemma 8.1 the form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ satisfies the same property as that of the function

f in Lemma 16.3. By Lemma 7.3 we see that the degree of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ for the stratum S is at least $2m+3$ and hence $d^S(\Omega) > 0$. Using Proposition 8.6, the form Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

The case when $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m+1)}$ is similar and follows from Lemma 16.4.

12.3. **The case $\ell = 2n-1$.** Let $\beta(2n-1) = \alpha_2$. By Lemma 18.1 we only need to check the cases when $\beta(p) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$. The proof $\Omega' = \mathrm{Res}_{t_{(2n-1)}=t_1} \dots \mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$ is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ in these cases follow similarly using Proposition 8.6.

The proof of Theorem 8.3 for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{B}_n$ is now complete.

13. The case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{D_n}$

The positive simple roots of D_n are $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$. The positive roots of D_n are of the form $\alpha_i+\alpha_{i+1}+\cdots+\alpha_{j-1}$ for $i<j<n$; $\alpha_i+\alpha_{i+1}+\cdots+\alpha_{j-1}+2\alpha_j+2\alpha_{j+1}+\cdots+2\alpha_{n-2}+\alpha_{n-1}+\alpha_n$ for $i<j<n-1$; $\alpha_i+\alpha_{i+1}+\cdots+\alpha_n$ for $i<n-1$; $\alpha_i+\alpha_{i+1}+\cdots+\alpha_{n-2}+\alpha_n$ for $i \leq n-1$ and α_n. If we formally put $\alpha_n = \alpha_{(n-1)}$ in the above expression of the positive roots we recover the positive roots of $B_{(n-1)}$.

There are two possible "patterns" of positive roots starting at α_1. The first pattern is $\alpha_1, (\alpha_1+\alpha_2), \dots, (\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\cdots+\alpha_{(n-2)}), (\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{(n-2)}+\alpha_{(n-1)}), (\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{(n-2)}+\alpha_{(n-1)}+\alpha_n), (\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{(n-3)}+2\alpha_{(n-2)}+\alpha_{(n-1)}+\alpha_n) \dots (\alpha_1+\alpha_2+2\alpha_3\cdots+2\alpha_{(n-3)}+2\alpha_{(n-2)}+\alpha_{(n-1)}+\alpha_n)$.

The second pattern is same as the first except the positive root $(\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{(n-2)}+\alpha_{(n-1)})$ is replaced by the positive roots $(\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_{(n-2)}+\alpha_n)$.

Since D_n is simply laced, the normalized Cartan killing form is given by $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$; $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = 0$ for $i+1 < j$ except when $i = n-2$ and $j = n$; $(\alpha_{n-2}, \alpha_n) = -1$; $(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}) = -1$ for $i \leq n-2$ and $(\alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n) = 0$.

The proof of Theorem 8.3 for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{D}_n$ is same as the case B_n. We only include the proof of Proposition 8.7 in the case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{D}_4$.

Let $\beta(1) = \alpha_1$. When $\ell = 1$, there is no residue and by Lemma 8.1 Ω has atmost simple poles at $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_2$.

13.1. **The case $\ell = 2$.** We consider $\Omega' = \mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$. By Proposition 8.6 the form Ω' has at most simple poles along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \{\alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$. We will show that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. The proof in both these cases is similar to proof of Proposition 10.1.

13.2. **The case $\ell = 3$.** We can assume that $\beta(3) = \alpha_3$. We consider the form $\Omega' = \mathrm{Res}_{t_3=t_1} \mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$. By Lemma 18.1 and Proposition 8.6 we only need to show that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$. The proof in this case also similar to the proof of Proposition 10.1.

13.3. **The case $\ell = 4$.** Let $\beta(4) = \alpha_4$. We consider the form $\Omega' = \mathrm{Res}_{t_4=t_1} \dots \mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$. By Lemma 18.1 and Proposition 8.6 we only need to show that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_4$.

13.3.1. *The case $\beta(p) = \alpha_4$.* We multiply the form Ω by a correction factor $\mathcal{P} = (t_1-t_2)(t_2-t_3)(t_2-t_4)(t_2-t_p)$ for the stratum S defined by $t_1 = t_2 = t_3 = t_4 = t_p$ to get a form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. By Lemma 8.1 the form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ vanishes on $t_2 = t_4 = t_p$. Thus $d^S(\Omega) \geq 1-4+4$. Hence the proof follows in this case by Proposition 8.6.

13.4. **The case $\ell = 5$.** Let $\beta(5) = \alpha_2$. We consider the form$\Omega' = \operatorname{Res}_{t_5=t_1} \dots \operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$. We will show that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

13.4.1. *The case $\beta(p) = \alpha_2$.* We multiply the form Ω by a multiplication factor of degree 9 for the stratum S defined by $t_1 = t_2 \dots = t_5 = t_p$ to get a form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. By Lemma 8.1 the form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ satisfies the properties of the function f in Lemma 16.3. Hence by Lemma 7.3 and Lemma 16.3 the degree of Ω' for the stratum S is at least 5. Now the proof follows from Proposition 8.6.

13.4.2. *The case $\beta(p) = \alpha_1$.* We multiply the form Ω by a multiplication factor of degree 8 for the stratum S defined by $t_1 = t_2 = \dots = t_5 = t_p$. By Lemma 8.1 the form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ satisfies the properties of the function f in Lemma 16.1. Hence the proof in this case follows as before.

13.4.3. *The case $\beta(p) = \alpha_3$ or $\beta(p) = \alpha_4$.* The proof that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ is similar.

This completes the proof of Theorem 8.3 for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{D}_4$.

Remark 13.1. *In the above proof for the case $\ell = 3$ by assuming $\beta(3) = \alpha_3$ we followed the first pattern of the positive roots starting at α_1. If we had assumed $\beta(3) = \alpha_4$ and followed the second pattern the proof would have been similar.*

14. THE CASE $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{C}_n$

The positive simple roots of C_n are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$. The positive roots of C_n are of the form $\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} + \dots + \alpha_j$ for $i < j \leq n$; $\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} + \dots + 2\alpha_j + 2\alpha_{j+1} + 2\alpha_{n-1} + \alpha_n$ for $i \leq j < n$. The highest root θ is given by $2\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + \dots + 2\alpha_{n-1} + \alpha_n$. The only possible "pattern" of positive roots starting at α_1 is $\alpha_1, (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2), \dots (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_n), (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_{(n-2)} + 2\alpha_{(n-1)} + \alpha_n) + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \dots + \alpha_{(n-3)} + 2\alpha_{(n-2)} + 2\alpha_{(n-1)} + \alpha_n) + \dots (\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 \dots + 2\alpha_{(n-2)} + 2\alpha_{(n-1)} + \alpha_n) + (2\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + \dots + 2\alpha_{(n-2)} + 2\alpha_{(n-1)} + \alpha_n)$.

The normalized Cartan killing form is given by $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = 1$ for $1 \leq i < n$; $(\alpha_n, \alpha_n) = 2$; $(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}) = -\frac{1}{2}$ for $1 \leq i < n$; $(\alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n) = -1$ and $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = 0$ for $i + 1 < j$.

Let $\beta(1) = \alpha_1$. We give a proof Proposition 8.7 in this case by dividing the proof into several cases. When $\ell = 1$, there are no residues and Lemma 8.1 tells us that Ω has at most simple poles $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_2$.

14.1. **The case $\ell \leq n$.** The proof follows easily from the same methods used in Proposition 10.1.

14.2. **The case $\ell = n + 1$.** Let $\beta(n+1) = \alpha_{(n-1)}$ and $\Omega'' = \operatorname{Res}_{t_n=t_1} \dots \operatorname{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$. We know that by the previous steps and Proposition 8.6 that the form Ω'' has at most simple poles along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_{n-1}$. Thus by Lemma 18.1 $\Omega' = \operatorname{Res}_{t_{n+1}=t_1} \Omega''$ is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) \neq \{\alpha_{(n-2)}, \alpha_{(n-1)}, \alpha_{(n)}\}$. If $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-2)}$ Proposition 8.6 tells us that Ω' has at most a simple pole along $t_1 = t_p$

14.2.1. *The case when* $\beta(p) = \alpha_n$. We multiply Ω with a correction factor of degree $n+3$ for the stratum S defined by $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_{(n+1)} = t_p$ to get a form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. By Proposition 8.6 we only need to show that $d^S(\Omega) > 0$. Thus it is enough to show that the degree of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ for the stratum S is at least 3. Lemma 8.1 tells us that $\widetilde{\Omega}$ has the same properties as f in Lemma 17.2. Now the proof follows from Lemma 17.2 and Lemma 7.3.

14.2.2. *The case when* $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-1)}$. When $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-1)}$ it follows similarly as above from Lemma 17.1 that Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$.

Let $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-2)}$. Then from Lemma 16.2 it follows similarly that Ω' has at most simple poles along $t_1 = t_p$.

14.3. **The case** $n+1 \leq \ell < 2n-1$**.** Let $\beta(n-m) = \beta(n+m) = \alpha_{(n-m)}$ for $m < n$. We prove the proposition by induction on ℓ. The initial step $\ell = n+1$ is proved above. Now we prove the inductive step. We assume that for $\ell \leq m-1$, the form $\Omega'' = \mathrm{Res}_{t_{(n+m-1)}=t_1} \ldots \mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$ is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) \neq \{\alpha_{n-m}\}$. Proposition 8.6 tells us that Ω'' has at most simple poles along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m)}$.

We consider the form $\Omega' = \mathrm{Res}_{t_{(n+m)}=t_1} \Omega''$. By Lemma 18.1 we get that the Ω' is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) \neq \{\alpha_{(n-m-1)}, \alpha_{(n-m)}, \alpha_{(n-m+1)}\}$. Proposition 8.6 and tells us that Ω' has at most simple poles along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m-1)}$.

14.3.1. *The case when* $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m)}$. We multiply Ω by a correction factor $\mathcal{P}$ of degree $n + 3m + 1$ for the stratum S defined by $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_{(n+m)} = t_p$ to get a form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. By Lemma 8.1 the form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ has the same properties as the function f in Lemma 17.3. Thus by Lemma 7.3 and Proposition 8.6 we are done.

14.3.2. *The case when* $\beta(p) = \alpha_{(n-m+1)}$. We multiply Ω by a correction factor $\mathcal{P}$ of degree $n + 3m$ for the stratum S defined by $t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_{(n+m)} = t_p$ to get a form $\widetilde{\Omega}$. By Lemma 8.1 the form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ has the same properties as the function f in Lemma 17.4. Thus by Lemma 7.3 and Proposition 8.6 we are done.

14.4. **The case** $\ell = 2n-1$**.** . By Lemma 18.1, Proposition 8.6 and the previous step we only need to show that $\Omega' = \mathrm{Res}_{t_{(2n-1)}=t_1} \ldots \mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1} \Omega$ is holomorphic along $t_1 = t_p$ if $\beta(p) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. The proof in this case is similar to the proof in the previous step.

The proof of Theorem 8.3 for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{C}_n$ is now complete.

15. KEY LEMMAS FOR G_2

Throughout this section f will denote a polynomial in multiple variables which is symmetric in some variables and vanishes along certain partial diagonals. We use these properties of f to give a lower bound on the total degree of f.

Lemma 15.1. *Suppose* $g(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ *is a symmetric polynomial in* $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ *which vanishes on* $u_1 = \cdots = u_n$*. Then* g *is a linear combination of functions of the form*

$$(u_i - u_j)^2 A(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$$

Proof. Clearly g is a linear combination of elements of the form $(u_1-u_2)A$. We just need to show that

$$\sum_{\sigma\in S_n}\sigma(u_1-u_2)A$$

is of the desired form. The above sum is

$$\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{\sigma\in S_n}\sigma(u_1-u_2)A(u_1,u_2,\dots,u_n)+\sum_{\sigma\in S_n}\sigma(12)(u_1-u_2)A(u_1,\dots,u_n))$$
$$=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\sigma\in S_n}\sigma(u_1-u_2)(A(u_1,u_2,\dots,u_n)-A(u_2,u_1,\dots,u_n))$$

and (u_1-u_2) divides $A(u_1,u_2,u_3,\dots,u_n)-A(u_2,u_1,u_3,\dots,u_n)$, so we are done. □

Lemma 15.2. *Suppose that $f(u_1,u_2,u_3,t_1,t_2,t_3)$ is a symmetric in u_1,u_2,u_3 and vanishes on the nine diagonals of the form $u_1=u_2=t_1$ (two u's and one t). Then, degree of f is ≥ 5.*

Proof. Write f as a sum

$$f=\big(f-f(\frac{\sum u_i}{3},\frac{\sum u_i}{3},\frac{\sum u_i}{3},t_1,t_2,t_3)\big)+h(\frac{\sum u_i}{3},t_1,t_2,t_3)$$

where

$$h(w,t_1,t_2,t_3)=f(w,w,w,t_1,t_2,t_3)$$

vanishes when $w=t_1$ or $w=t_2$ or $w=t_3$, so we may write

$$h(w,t_1,t_2,t_3)=(w-t_1)(w-t_2)(w-t_3)g(w,t_1,t_2,t_3)$$

Clearly, $f-f(\frac{\sum u_i}{3},\frac{\sum u_i}{3},\frac{\sum u_i}{3},t_1,t_2,t_3)$ vanishes on $u_1=u_2=u_3$, and is hence of the form

$$(u_1-u_2)^2A+(u_2-u_3)^2B+(u_1-u_3)^2C$$

Therefore,

$$f=(u_1-u_2)^2A+(u_2-u_3)^2B+(u_1-u_3)^2C+(w-t_1)(w-t_2)(w-t_3)g(w,t_1,t_2,t_3) \tag{15.1}$$

where $w=\frac{\sum u_i}{3}$. Put $u_1=u_2=t_1=c$, then the above equation reads

$$0=(u_3-c)^2D+\frac{1}{3}(u_3-c)(\frac{2c+u_3}{3}-t_2)(\frac{2c+u_3}{3}-t_3)g(\frac{2c+u_3}{3},c,t_2,t_3)$$

divide by u_3-c and set $u_3=c$ to get $g(c,c,t_2,t_3)=0$, so $g(w,t_1,t_2,t_3)$ is divisible by $(w-t_1)(w-t_2)(w-t_3)$.

The degree of f is atleast the degree of h, so if $h\neq 0$ we are done. In this case, (15.1) with $u_1=u_2=c$ (note that if f vanishes on $u_1=u_2$ then it vanishes on all 3 of the u diagonals to order two and is hence of degree at least 6)

$$f(c,c,u_3,t_1,t_2,t_3)=(c-u_3)^2D(c,u_3,t_1,t_2,t_3)$$

Now, the right hand side vanishes for $t_1=c$, so D is divisible by $(c-t_1)(c-t_2)(c-t_3)$, and hence degree of f is at least five. □

Lemma 15.3. *Suppose that $f(u_1,u_2,t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4)$ is symmetric separately in u_1,u_2 and t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4 and vanishes on diagonals of the form $u_1=u_2=t_1$ (one t) and $t_1=t_2=t_3=t_4=u_1$ (two of these). Then, degree of $f\geq 4$.*

Proof. Write f as

$$(f - f(\frac{u_1+u_2}{2}, \frac{u_1+u_2}{2}, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)) + g(w, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$$

where $g(w, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = f(w, w, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ and $w = \frac{u_1+u_2}{2}$.

The term in the first brackets vanishes when $u_1 = u_2$ and is symmetric in u_1, u_2. Also note that $g(w, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ is of the form $(w - t_1)(w - t_2)(w - t_3)(w - t_4)h$. So, we reduce to the case $g = 0$ so

$$f(u_1, u_2, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (u_1 - u_2)^2 A(u_1, u_2, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$$

If A vanishes on $t_1 = t_2 = t_3 = t_4$, then by Lemma 15.1, it has degree ≥ 2. So assume that A is non vanishing on $t_1 = t_2 = t_3 = t_4 = t$, so write

$$f(u_1, u_2, t, t, t, t) = (u_1 - u_2)^2 A(u_1, u_2, t, t, t, t)$$

Put $u_1 = t$ which makes the left hand side vanish and hence $A(u_1, u_2, t, t, t, t)$ vanishes when $u_1 = t$. Therefore $A(u_1, u_2, t, t, t, t)$ is divisible by $(u_1 - t)(u_2 - t)$ and we are done. □

16. Key Lemmas for B_n and D_n

As before f denotes a polynomial in multiple variables which is symmetric in some variables and vanishes along certain partial diagonals. We give lower bounds on the total degree of f in each of the following lemmas.

Lemma 16.1. *Suppose that $f(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2)$ is symmetric separately in u_1, u_2 and v_1, v_2. Also assume that f vanishes on diagonals of the form $u_1 = u_2 = v_1$(two u's one v); $v_1 = v_2 = t_1$(two v's and one t) and $v_1 = v_2 = u_1$(two v's and one u). Then, degree of $f \geq 4$.*

Proof. We rewrite the function f as follows

$$f(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2) - f(u_1, u_2, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, t_1, t_2) + f(u_1, u_2, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, t_1, t_2).$$

Now since $f_1 = f(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2) - f(u_1, u_2, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, t_1, t_2)$ is symmetric in v_1 and v_2 and vanishes at $v_1 = v_2$, we see that $(v_1 - v_2)^2$ divides f_1. If $f(u_1, u_2, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, t_1, t_2) \neq 0$ we can write f as

$$f(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2) = (v_1 - v_2)^2 A(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2) + (v - t_1)(v - t_2)(v - u_1)(v - u_2)g,$$

where $v = \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}$. Thus we are done if $f(u_1, u_2, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, t_1, t_2) \neq 0$.

If $f(u_1, u_2, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, t_1, t_2) = 0$ then we can write f as $(v_1 - v_2)^2 A(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2)$. If $A(u, u, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2) = 0$, then $(u_1 - u_2)^2$ divides A. If $A(u, u, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2) \neq 0$, then $(u - v_1)(u - v_2)$ divides $A(u, u, v_1, v_2, t_1, t_2)$. Thus we are done. □

Lemma 16.2. *Suppose $f(t_1, u_1, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2})$ is symmetric in t_a, u_a for $1 \leq a < m + 2$. Further assume that f vanishes on the diagonals of the form $t_a = u_a = \{t_{a-1}, t_{a+1}, u_{a-1}, u_{a+1}\}$ for $1 \leq a < m + 2$. Then, degree of f is at least $2m + 2$.*

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction on m. Lemma 16.1 is the case when $m = 1$.

Let us denote $w_a = \frac{t_a+u_a}{2}$. We rewrite our function f as a sum of two functions $g = f - f_1$ and f_1 where $f_1(w_1, t_2, \ldots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2}) = f(w_1, w_1, t_2, u_2, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2})$. Now the function g is symmetric in t_1 and u_1 and vanishes at $t_1 = u_1$. Thus we get that $(t_1 - u_1)^2$ divides g. First let us assume that $f_1 \neq 0$, it follows from the properties of f that $(w_1 - t_2)(w_1 - u_2)$ divides

f_1. Thus $f_1(w_1, t_2, u_2, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2}) = (w_1 - t_2)(w_1 - u_2)g_1(w_1, t_2, u_2, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2})$. It is enough to show that g_1 has degree at least $2m$. We put $t_1 = u_1$ and observe that the function $f_2(t_2, u_2, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2}) = g_1(t_1, t_2, u_2, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2})$ satisfies similar properties as that of the function f but in less number of variables. Hence by induction we are done.

Now let us consider the case when $f_1 = 0$. From the previous discussion we get the function $f(t_1, u_1, \cdots t_{m+2}, u_{m+2}) = (t_1 - u_1)^2 A(t_1, u_1, t_2, u_2, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2})$. A careful inspection tell us that $f_2(t_2, u_2, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2}) = A(t_1, u_1, t_2, u_2, \cdots, t_{m+2}, u_{m+2})$ satisfies the same properties as function f with less variables. Hence by induction we are done. □

The proof of the next two Lemma follows from induction and Lemma 16.2.

Lemma 16.3. *Suppose* $f(t_0, t_1, u_1, v_1, t_2, u_2, t_3, u_3, \cdots, t_{m+1}, u_{m+1})$ *is symmetric in* t_a, v_a, u_a *for all* $1 \leq a < m+1$. *Assume that* f *vanishes on diagonals of the form* $t_a = u_a = \{t_{a-1}, t_{a+1}, u_{a-1}, u_{a+1}\}$ *for* $1 \leq a < m+1$ *and on the diagonal* $t_2 = u_2 = v_1$. *Further assume that* f *vanishes on diagonals of the form* $t_1 = v_1 = \{t_0, t_2, u_2\}$ *and of the form* $u_1 = v_1 = \{t_0, t_2, u_2\}$, *then* f *has degree at least* $2m+3$.

Lemma 16.4. *Suppose* $f(t_0, t_1, u_1, t_2, u_2, v_2, t_3, u_3, \cdots, t_{m+1}, u_{m+1})$ *is symmetric in the variables* t_a, v_a, u_a *for all* $1 \leq a < m+1$. *Assume that* f *vanishes on diagonals of the form* $t_a = u_a = \{t_{a-1}, t_{a+1}, u_{a-1}, u_{a+1}\}$ *for* $1 \leq a < m+1$ *and on the diagonals* $t_1 = u_1 = v_2$; $t_3 = u_3 = v_2$. *Further assume that* f *also vanishes on diagonals of the form* $t_2 = v_2 = \{t_1, t_3, u_1, u_3\}$ *and of the form* $u_2 = v_2 = \{t_1, t_3, u_1, u_3\}$. *Then,* f *has degree at least* $2m+4$.

17. KEY LEMMAS FOR C_n

As in the previous sections f will also denote a polynomial in multiple variables which is symmetric in some variables and vanishes along certain partial diagonals. The proof of the next two Lemmas are similar to Lemma 16.1.

Lemma 17.1. *Assume* $f(t_1, u_1, u_2, u_3, v_1)$ *is symmetric in* u_i*'s and vanishes on diagonals of the form* $u_1 = u_2 = t_1$ *(two* u*'s and* t_1 *) and* $u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = v_1$. *Then,* f *has degree at least* 3.

Lemma 17.2. *Assume* $f(t_1, u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2)$ *is symmetric separately in* u*'s and* v*'s and vanishes on the diagonals of the form* $u_1 = u_2 = t_1$ *and* $v_1 = v_2 = u_1$ *(two* v*'s and one* u*). Then,* f *has degree at least* 3.

The proof of the next two lemmas are similar to the proof of Lemma 16.2.

Lemma 17.3. *Suppose* $f(t_0, t_1, u_1, v_1, t_2, u_2, t_3, u_3, \cdots, t_m, u_m)$ *is symmetric in* t_a, u_a, v_a *for all* $1 \leq a \leq m$. *Assume that* f *vanishes on diagonals of the form* $t_a = u_a = \{t_{a-1}, t_{a+1}, u_{a-1}, u_{a+1}\}$ *for* $1 \leq a \leq m$. *Further assume that* f *vanishes on diagonals of the form* $t_1 = v_1 = \{t_0, t_2, u_2\}$ *and* $u_1 = v_1 = \{t_0, t_2, u_2\}$, *then* f *has degree at least* $2m+2$.

Lemma 17.4. *Suppose* $f(t_0, t_1, u_1, t_2, u_2, v_2, t_3, u_3, \cdots, t_m, u_m)$ *is symmetric in the variables* t_a, u_a, v_a *for all* $1 \leq a \leq m$. *Assume that* f *vanishes on diagonals of the form* $t_a = u_a = \{t_{a-1}, t_{a+1}, u_{a-1}, u_{a+1}\}$ *for* $1 \leq a \leq m$ *and on the diagonals* $t_1 = u_1 = v_2$, $t_3 = u_3 = v_2$. *Further assume that* f *vanishes on the diagonals of the form* $u_1 = v_1 = \{t_0, t_2, u_2\}$ *and* $t_1 = v_1 = \{t_0, t_2, u_2\}$. *Then,* f *has degree at least* $2m+1$.

Remark 17.5. *In the case of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{F}_4$ we will need to prove several degree lemmas, for example: Let f be a polynomial in 12 variables $u_1, u_2,\ v_1, v_2, v_3,\ w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5,\ x_1, x_2$, with the following properties*

1. *f is symmetric (separately) in u's, v's, w's and x's.*
2. *f vanishes on the following partial diagonals: equality of two u's and one v, two v's and one u, two v's and one w, two w's and one x, two x's and one w; and three w's and one v.*

Then, we will need to show that the degree of f is ≥ 21.

18. Poles of Residues

Through this section we assume that Ω is a top degree form defined in a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^M$, which is regular on the complement of the union of $(\binom{M}{2} + M$ many) divisors $t_i = t_j, i < j$ and $t_i = 0$,

Lemma 18.1. *Let Ω has at most a simple pole along $t_1 = t_2$.*

1. *Suppose that Ω is regular at the generic point of $t_1 = t_3$ and at the generic point of $t_2 = t_3$. Then, $\mathrm{Res}_{t_1=t_2}\Omega$ a form on $(t_1, t_3, t_4, \dots)$ is generically regular on $t_1 = t_3$.*
2. *Suppose that Ω has a pole of order less than n along $t_3 = t_4$ and a simple pole along $t_1 = t_2$. Then, $\mathrm{Res}_{t_1=t_2}\Omega$ a form on $(t_1, t_3, t_4, \dots)$ has also poles along $t_3 = t_4$ of order less than n.*

Proof. For the first part we proceed as follows:

Assume
$$\Omega = \frac{g(t_1, \dots, t_M)}{P(t_1 - t_2)} dt_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dt_M,$$
where g is a holomorphic function and P is a polynomial in $t_1, \dots, t_M$ whose factors are of the form $t_i^{n_i}$ and $(t_i - t_j)^{a_{i,j}}$ for suitable exponents n_i and $a_{i,j}$.

Since $P(t, t, t, t_4, \dots, t_M) \neq 0$ (generically), therefore the residue which is (up to sign)
$$\frac{g(t_1, t_1, t_3, \dots, t_M)}{P(t_1, t_1, t_3, \dots, t_M)} dt_1 \wedge dt_2 \wedge dt_4 \wedge \cdots \wedge dt_M$$
is generically regular on $t_1 = t_3$.

The proof of the second part follows from the first.

Remark 18.2. *Note that if P had a term of the form $(t_1 + t_2 - 2t_3)$, then after $t_1 = t_2$, we would have had a new pole at $t_1 = t_3$ in the residue. It is important that the polar set of Ω does not contain sets like $t_1 + t_3 = t_2 + t_4$, which after $t_1 = t_2$ turn into a $t_3 = t_4$.* □

18.1. **Iterated Residues.**

Lemma 18.3. *Suppose Ω has a simple pole along $t_1 = t_2$ and along $t_3 = t_4$. Then*
$$\mathrm{Res}_{t_4=t_3}\mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\Omega = \mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\mathrm{Res}_{t_4=t_3}\Omega$$

By induction, we get the following.

Lemma 18.4. *Let $L < M - 1$ be any positive integer. Then the following equality of residues holds:*
$$\mathrm{Res}_{t_{L+2}=t_{L+1}}\mathrm{Res}_{t_L=t_1}\cdots\mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\Omega = \mathrm{Res}_{t_L=t_1}\cdots\mathrm{Res}_{t_2=t_1}\mathrm{Res}_{t_{L+2}=t_{L+1}}\Omega.$$

Lemma 18.5. *Suppose I_1 and I_2 are disjoint subsets of $[M]$. Then*

$$\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I}_1}\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I}_2}\Omega=\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I}_2}\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I}_1}\Omega.$$

Lemma 18.6. *Let $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n$ be pairwise disjoint subsets of $[M]$ such that $|I_j| = m_j$. Then for any $\sigma \in S_n$ the following equality of iterated residues of Ω holds:*

$$\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I}_{\sigma(1)}}\cdots\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I}_{\sigma(n)}}\Omega=\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I}_1}\cdots\operatorname{Res}_{\vec{I}_n}\Omega.$$

References

[1] A. Beauville, *Conformal blocks, Fusion rings and the Verlinde formula,* Proc. of the Hirzebruch 65 Conf. on Algebraic Geometry, Israel Math. Conf. Proc. **9**, 75-96 (1996).

[2] P. Belkale, *Unitarity of the KZ/Hitchin connection on conformal blocks in genus* 0 *for arbitrary Lie algebras*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, to appear.

[3] R. Bezrukavnikov, M. Finkelberg, and V. Schechtman, *Factorizable sheaves and quantum groups*, Lecture notes in mathematics, **1691**, Springer 1998.

[4] N. Bourbaki, *Groupes et algèbres de Lie*, chapitres 4, 5 et 6, Masson, Paris, 1981.

[5] E. Brieskorn, *Sur les group des tresses (d'aprés V.I. Arnold).* Seminaire Bourbaki 24, 1971/72. (Lect. Notes Math., vol. 317) Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer 1973.

[6] P. Deligne, *Théorie de Hodge II.* Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. No. **40** 5-57.

[7] B. Feigin, V. Schechtman, and A. Varchenko, *On algebraic equations satisfied by hypergeometric correlators in WZW models. II*, Comm. Math. Phys. Volume **170**, Number 1 (1995), 219-247.

[8] E. Looijenga, *Unitarity of* SL(2)*-conformal blocks in genus zero*, J. Geom. Phys. **59**, 654662 (2009).

[9] T. R. Ramadas, *The Harder-Narasimhan trace and unitarity of the KZ/Hitchin connection: genus 0*, Annals of Math. Vol. **169** (2009), No. 1, 1-39.

[10] V. V. Schechtman and A. N. Varchenko, *Arrangements of hyperplanes and Lie algebra homology*, Invent. Math. **106**, 139194 (1991)

[11] J. P. Serre, Complex Semisimple Lie algebras, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.

[12] V. Schechtman, H. Terao, and A. Varchenko, *Local systems over complements of hyperplanes and the Kac-Kazhdan conditions for singular vectors*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **100** (1995), 93102.

[13] C. Sorger, *La formule de Verlinde*, Séminaire Bourbaki **794** (1994).

[14] A. Tsuchiya and Y. Kanie, *Vertex operators in conformal field theory on* $\mathbb{P}^1$ *and monodromy representations of braid group*, in Conformal field theory and solvable lattice models (Kyoto, 1986), vol. **16** of Adv. Stud. Pure Math., Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1988, 297-372.

[15] A. Tsuchiya, K. Ueno and Y. Yamada, *Conformal field theory on universal family of stable curves with gauge symmetries*, Integrable systems in quantum field theory and statistical mechanics, 459–566, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., **19**, Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1989.

[16] K. Ueno, *Conformal field theory with gauge symmetry*, Fields Institute Monographs, vol. **24**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.

[17] A. Varchenko, *Multidimensional hypergeometric functions and representation theory of Lie algebras and quantum groups*, Advanced Series in Mathematical Physics, 21. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1995.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNC-CHAPEL HILL, CB #3250, PHILLIPS HALL, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27599

E-mail address: `belkale@email.unc.edu`

E-mail address: `swarnava@live.unc.edu`